

but the committees of the Senate have not passed on it. The Senate has not passed on it. A two-thirds vote will be required to suspend the rule. I hope the rule will not be suspended, and that the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion to suspend the rule was not agreed to, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2968) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, this afternoon the House sent a message over asking for a conference on House bill 2714. I shall not discuss it, but ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2714, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,  
June 30, 1943.

Resolved, That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate still further insist on its amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61, agree to the still further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint as conferees on the part of the Senate, the same conferees who served previously on this bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the presiding officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE con-

ferees on the part of the Senate at the still further conference.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and several midshipmen for appointment as ensigns, all in the Navy.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD— JOHN M. HOUSTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, July 1, 1943, at 12 meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years from August 27, 1943.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Virginia V. Tucker, Helena.  
William B. Mims, Phenix City.

##### ARKANSAS

Don H. Stalls, Turrell.

##### CALIFORNIA

Victor F. Vieira, Esparto.

##### MINNESOTA

James M. McGuire, Rush City.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, source of every joy and the inspiration of every earth-born hope, well may Thy praise our lips employ; we bless Thee that our lives are so mercifully preserved and still hold the freshness of Thy love. We rejoice that this is our Father's world; life, deep and boundless, is ours and the wings of the morning are not strong enough to carry us away from the sheltering care of the Good Shepherd.

This day, interpret to us again the ways of righteousness and truth, making us aware of our mastery over human life and destiny. In every situation help us to show moral self-control with a very deep sense of our trusteeship. Thou who art the Ancient of Days, who led our fathers to summits of faith and assurance, lead us on, feeling the supreme obligation that we owe this generation. Almighty God, amid the strife and confusion among men, let Thy light, which has never been extinguished, shine forth like a beacon from a promising morning. Kindle in all eager, passionate hearts an invincible desire to subdue all discords, to unite against antagonisms within and military vandalism without. Grant that we may seek eagerly the blessing of Him who bade us love mercy, deal justly, and to walk humbly with God, the Father of us all. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2935. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1109. An act to increase by \$400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment,' approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States."

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARE, TARVER, THOMAS of Texas, ANDERSON of New Mexico, ENGEL, KEEFE, and H. CARL ANDERSEN.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Public Lands, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the course of the general debate today.

The SPEAKER. If there is general debate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the gentleman from Idaho confine his request to general debate on the Lanham bill, because conference reports may be considered, and, of course, we would not want any committee to be sit-

ting during the consideration of conference reports.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that the Committee on the Public Lands is very vigilant in responding to all calls of the House. If this request is granted, I can assure the Speaker that the members of the committee will be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Speaker has stated before, and I agree with him, that committees should not seek permission to sit while a bill is being considered under the 5-minute rule in the House. If the gentleman's request covers permission to sit during the general debate on the Lanham bill, which would include the debate on the rule, that is one thing, but permission to sit while a conference report is under consideration is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. WHITE. I am in full agreement with the gentleman's suggestion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman modify his request and ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to sit during the general debate on the Lanham bill?

Mr. WHITE. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell the House what bill the committee has under consideration?

Mr. WHITE. The Committee on the Public Lands is holding hearings on the Elk Hills Naval Oil Reserve contract.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It merits inquiry, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, delivered at the Republican State Convention held at Appleton, Wis., last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Toledo Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### DISSENSION ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Vice President WALLACE has attacked the Secretary of Commerce, accusing him of obstructing the acquisition of critical materials required for the war

effort and, among other things, of impeding the delivery of essential materials to General MacArthur.

Secretary Jones has replied that the 28-page attack is filled with malice and misstatements.

This further evidence of dissension and lack of coordination on the home front is deplorable. It is unthinkable that these two top officials in the Roosevelt administration are unable to compose their differences and cooperate in the war effort.

Secretary Jones, in effect, asks for a congressional investigation. In compliance with his request, I am today introducing a resolution providing for a thoroughgoing investigation of the charges made.

Division of authority, bungling, and incompetency cannot be allowed to continue on the home front without undermining the war effort. The home front must be made worthy of the millions who must bear the brunt of the conflict on the fighting fronts overseas.

#### PRICE STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McLEAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### CONGRESS NOT TRYING TO STOP RUN-AWAY INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the letter Mr. Chester Davis wrote to the President he said the reason subsidies would not work was that we had not passed tax laws that would siphon off enough purchasing power. The President replied that he has been trying to get tax laws passed. I do not think the President is responsible and I do not think Mr. Morgenthau is responsible. You will recall that this Congress has resented in the past the administration's sending bills up to the House and asking the House to pass them. A revenue bill must originate in the House. The Treasury has adopted the policy of being ready and willing to submit any information and be helpful in any way in the world, but not being in the position of being dictatorial and telling the House what to do. It is not Mr. Morgenthau's fault, it is the fault of Congress. Congress will be to blame when we have run-away inflation, which we are on the brink of right now because we have not only not siphoned off taxes, we have crippled the only agency that is trying to stop inflation and even cut out the appropriation for the O. W. I., the only organization that has a well-planned and coordinated educational campaign to stop run-away inflation.

## THE BERMUDA CONFERENCE AND AFTER

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a resolution of the American Legion Post of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Battle of Washington reaches a crescendo of thinly veiled innuendoes and crashing derogations.

With the Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare—who in another capacity is the Vice President of the United States—charging the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with “hamstringing bureaucracy” we have the unusual case of a bureaucrat calling a bureaucrat a bureaucrat. To this discordant note President Roosevelt adds a charge against newspaper men of responsibility for the bickering in Washington.

It begins to look as if the “Bureautopia” of the visionaries is in danger of becoming like the proverbial house divided against itself—it cannot stand.

But as dark as the picture may be there is always the silver lining. There is yet hope for “horse sense,” logic, and sound American fundamentals, and we can be thankful that they are still with us to fall back on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters I have received from Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## SETTLEMENT AND LIQUIDATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a situation that has arisen in the last few days with respect to the settlement and liquidation of war contracts.

About a week ago a representative of the War Department very courteously came to me, as Chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, with a proposal that there be attached as a legislative rider to two appropriation bills involving some \$105,000,000, permission to make settlement and close out contracts. It was very considerate of him to say to the legislative committee that they would like to attach a legislative rider. Of course, I objected, and the committee proceeded to have hearings on the matter.

We find that it is a difficult and complicated question; that the Comptroller General has advised me that it is so far-reaching that he is even unable to give us an opinion at this time on it. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that, due to the recess, we have postponed completion of the hearings and final disposition of the matter until after the recess, in order that we may give it deliberate and careful consideration, and have time to think it over. This ought to emphasize the error involved in the practice of attaching legislative riders on appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

## EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1134), to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Mississippi explain the bill for the benefit of the House?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to provide \$10,000,000 as an emergency appropriation for the repair of flood-control works damaged or destroyed, and to strengthen those works, by the recent major floods extending from the Wabash River in Illinois and Indiana to the Arkansas River in Kansas, and embracing excessive floods along the Wabash, the Sangamon, the Illinois, the

upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Arkansas, and the tributaries of those rivers, in which the Chief of Engineers estimated that some 9,000,000 acres of land were inundated and some \$96,000,000 in damages were done. This bill is reported unanimously by the Committee on Flood Control to the House, after extensive investigation and hearings. It is my purpose in calling up the Senate bill, which has been passed by the other body, to offer the House bill as amended by the committee, as a substitute for the Senate bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And in that way you could send it to the conference committee for the final draft?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In my district in several counties through which the Wabash River flows this Congress 3 or 4 years ago authorized a survey of the Wabash and its tributaries for purposes of certain flood-control work. During this recent flood thousands of acres of corn and other crops were destroyed. I wonder if any of the funds made available by this bill will be allocated to the project along the Wabash River, to correct that situation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It will be allocated not only to the Wabash but along all other rivers where existing works, whether constructed by local interests, by the people themselves, or by the Federal Government's participation were damaged or destroyed, and for strengthening those levees, and other flood-control works.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is there anything provided for dredging the channel of the river to keep it from overflowing thousands of acres of rich bottom land in that valley? This authorizes the War Department or some other agency to dredge the channel in that river to stop these disastrous floods?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say in response to the gentleman's question that this is an emergency appropriation. It does not authorize the construction of any new works. Those works could only be authorized after the Chief of Engineers has submitted a report and after the committee and the Congress have adopted that report. But I may say that the House has conducted hearings with respect to the Wabash and other rivers upon which we have heard Members of the Senate and the House, and those hearings will be available soon, and it is proposed for new work to submit a comprehensive bill sometime later to deal with additional projects and authorizations. But this matter here deals with the restoration of works along the Wabash and along the other rivers of the country which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, recently.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I want to inquire of the gentleman whether this bill provides

for immediate repair work for the levees along the river to protect the valleys.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct. Under existing law, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1941, \$1,000,000 is authorized to be allocated for flood repairs and for flood relief, annually.

The Chief of Engineers reports that because of three excessive floods along the Missouri River, two excessive floods, one being 9 feet higher than any flood which had occurred previously along the Arkansas River, and excessive floods along the upper Mississippi River, that the \$1,000,000 is utterly inadequate, and the committee, following the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, proposes to make available \$10,000,000 for emergency work.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to add for the benefit of the House that the Corps of Engineers has been working very arduously and I understand are without funds for this emergency work.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is one of the purposes of this legislation, to provide additional funds.

Mr. PLOESER. I also want to say on behalf of a great many people who are living in the Missouri River Valley, that I compliment the Committee on the splendid work it is doing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand this bill and the situation regarding the section 5 emergency money under the flood-control law is made necessary by two factors. Those are the several recent floods, plus the fact that the War Production Board, and perhaps some other agencies, have stopped the various flood-control works that were under way.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is generally true, primarily because of the floods themselves, and because even if the War Production Board had not stopped the regular work this emergency repair work is so important that it should be done.

Mr. CURTIS. One other question. There has been considerable said here about the Missouri River and the Missouri River Basin, and there was before the committee a special bill to authorize some \$3,000,000 for emergency work on that river. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi to tell us for the record how this bill covers that situation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I propose to take that up in the 5-minute discussion. I will say that the gentleman from Nebraska appeared before the committee, of which he is a prominent and valuable member, as well as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CANNON), and other gentlemen who have been interested in this matter. This is a committee bill, and covers all the bills.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that even if we authorize this ex-

penditure this money cannot be used to build levees beyond their preexisting heights nor to construct new levees. It is just the repair work and the replacements, where they have to be made, that are to be covered in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is generally correct in his understanding, but I want to be perfectly frank with the gentleman and the House and state that it is the recommendation of the Committee on Flood Control that this bill should go further than the previous emergency works. In other words, if a levee has been damaged, or if it has been crevassed and it is found necessary to increase the height of the levee, or to increase the section of the replacement, the language of this bill will permit of the building of the levee to a height and section to which it should be built rather than at a later time rebuilding the repaired levee. The work that can be done under this bill, while it is emergency in character, will permit levees where repaired or restored to be constructed to the proper height and section because it is felt it would be wasting Federal funds just to build the levees to the former height when the entire levee line should be rebuilt later. As stated, the bill does not provide for constructing flood-control works where none now exists; it does not provide for major improvements or extensions, but only for repairs and minor improvements.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the only new work that can actually be done?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. On existing levees, if such work is found necessary.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. There is no provision in this bill made for loans to those who have suffered flood damages?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; not at all. The Congress has made ample provision for rehabilitation loans, and under existing statutes loans may be made to individuals suffering flood damages, as was done in previous floods.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman from Mississippi says this bill authorizes the restoration of levees.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does it also authorize the extending of the levees where that is necessary?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question by saying that it authorizes the restoration of levees and the strengthening of levees so as to tie in to a levee where repaired or restored that may be built larger than it was formerly, and in that sense the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. We have a bad situation on the Missouri side of the Missouri River up in northwest Missouri. Many of the levees there have been damaged or destroyed by the recent floodwaters and must be repaired and re-

placed and in many instances should be extended in order to protect thousands of acres of fertile Missouri soil.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am thoroughly aware of that and the committee went into it very carefully. Permanent provision for new works will be contained in a bill the committee proposes to bring in later.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much does this bill carry?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Ten million dollars.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it provide for any dams on these streams?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. All this bill provides for is just the restoring and repairing of existing works where they were constructed by the local interests or by the Federal Government and strengthening repairs and restorations, where made, so that the restorations may be permanent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general", made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

SEC. 2. In order to aid in the rehabilitation, including necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of railroads engaged in interstate commerce whose properties have been destroyed or damaged in whole or in part by flood in 1943, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is authorized to make rehabilitation loan or loans to any such railroad or to the receivers or trustees thereof in such manner, upon such terms and conditions, and with such security as the Corporation may prescribe; except that each such loan shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum and shall contain provisions for the amortization thereof over a period of not to exceed 40 years. The total amount of loans and commitments to railroads, receivers, and trustees under this section shall not exceed at any one time \$25,000,000. The amount of note, bond, debenture, and other such obligation which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provision of this section. The proceeds of any loan made pursuant to this section shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities in any area affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out in such area by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting in such area of any crops which are essential to the war effort.

SEC. 5. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation 'Flood control, general', made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I should like to make a brief statement.

The substitute I offer is the bill reported by the House Committee on Flood Control with the committee amendment. As will be noticed from the House committee report on this bill the Senate amended S. 1134 by including the language of the House bill as reported, and in addition to the language of the House bill the Senate authorized \$25,000,000 for loans to railroads, on account of flood damages, authorized rehabilitation loans, and authorized the suspension of quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act where recent floods occurred. It is our view that the House should adopt the bill as reported by the House Committee on Flood Control, the purpose being to authorize \$10,000,000, the amount recom-

mended by the Chief of Engineers, approved by the Secretary of War, and approved by the Director of the Budget as being absolutely imperative to provide for the repair and restoration of levees and other flood works throughout the Nation. It is the view of the Committee on Flood Control that the other amendments in the Senate bill are not satisfactory and that the adoption of the amendment I propose should enable this legislation to go to conference where the amendments adopted by the Senate may be considered.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is there any limit as to what streams shall be considered when these repairs are made? In other words, will it apply to tributary streams as well as to the main stems of the principal rivers?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The only limitation at all is that it is applicable to all the rivers of the United States. As I stated a few moments ago, the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and several Members from Indiana and Illinois introduced similar bills. Most of those bills were applicable to the streams in which the individual Members were interested. It was the view of the Committee on Flood Control that all of the rivers where floods have occurred should be treated alike, and the pending bill is not restricted to any stream or to the tributaries of any stream.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I take this opportunity of complimenting the very able chairman of the Committee on Flood Control for bringing in this bill which I feel will have a very great beneficial interest to that part of the country which was so badly devastated by the recent floods.

Mr. GRANGER. What limitation is placed on the use of these funds by the words "recent floods"?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is about as broad as language could be. The words "recent floods" would be for interpretation of the Chief of Engineers, but it is the intent to include the floods of 1943. The testimony before the committee, which went into this matter very carefully, showed that the recent floods extended from the Sangamon River and the Wabash primarily to the Arkansas in Kansas and the upper Missouri, but that there were also floods in other parts of the country, including California.

Mr. Speaker, I believe with that statement, unless there are some further questions, that this bill should be passed. It is an emergency matter. As I previously stated, it provides for the repair and restoration along every stream and every river along which floods have occurred. Of course, it is an emergency measure and does not undertake to provide for new flood works that have not been heretofore constructed by local interests or authorized by the Congress of the United States, and constructed by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Is this the bill to which Senator McCLELLAN offered an amendment in the Senate in reference to the building of roads that were damaged by flood waters?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that I do not recall the junior Senator from Arkansas having offered such an amendment to this bill, but I understood that the junior Senator did offer an amendment to the highway bill which will come up shortly for consideration, which bill is now in conference.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. As a member of the committee, I want to say that the full committee is behind this bill. I felt it should be reported in some form unanimously. It does contain a provision which gives a little advantage to two groups of projects; however, those were protected and taken care of in earlier legislation. The purpose of the provision in the bill is to insure that those particular projects which had already obtained priority in earlier legislation would not be interfered with by virtue of this emergency legislation. With reference to the sums of money which would be made available, that will be spent in accordance with the determination of the Army engineers so that all parts of the rivers will be protected and does not result in one project getting an advantage over another. The money will be spent in the best interest of the whole country.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite well aware of the fact that I am in accord with his views. In my judgment neither the Hartford, Conn., nor the Louisiana projects should have been included. They are both already provided for under existing law.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I want to commend the committee on its fine work in this matter.

The House bill which I offer as a substitute authorizes \$10,000,000 to be appropriated, and that pending the appropriation that amount may be allotted from existing flood-control appropriations, to be reimbursed provided no funds allotted under this authority shall be diverted from the unobligated funds made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act of 1944, for specific projects therein enumerated which are located in Connecticut and Louisiana. Section 2 of the bill provides that it is additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of existing legislation.

The funds are to be expended by the Chief of Engineers in the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by

recent floods. I invite attention to the report of the committee. The bill enlarges the authority of the Chief of Engineers in section 5 of the act of 1941. It authorizes the Chief of Engineers to strengthen the levees repaired or restored. As pointed out in the report, short extensions to provide adequate ties to high ground can be made. Short setbacks may be made, but only minor improvements can be made under the authority to strengthen. Where there is a break or a crevasse, the Secretary of War is authorized in restoring or rebuilding the levee or other protective work to construct it to the proper grade and section. If the recent floods demonstrated that the levee generally is too low or too small, the part restored or repaired could be built to the proper section. When the remaining levee is enlarged and raised, it would not, therefore, be necessary to rebuild or raise the part of the levee restored or repaired. The emergency appropriation does not authorize major improvements. As stated, the appropriation authorized is additional and supplemental to the existing authority for the allocation of \$1,000,000 annually. I trust that the bill will pass unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein some tables which I have had prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency measure and should be passed without opposition; but it does not begin to cure the trouble. Until we do on all other rivers of America what we have done on the Tennessee, we are going to have these recurrent flood disasters coupled with an unconscionable waste of one of America's greatest natural resources, and that is the hydroelectric power in these streams and their tributaries.

I have just had compiled figures for 1942 showing the amount of electricity used in America and the overcharges by States according to the Tennessee Valley Authority rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates; the Bonneville Adminis-

tration rates, and the Ontario, Canada, rates.

According to the T. V. A. rates the American people were overcharged \$1,185,233,674 in 1942.

According to the Tacoma, Wash., rate, the overcharges were \$1,583,000,000.

According to the Bonneville rates the overcharges were \$1,556,000,000.

According to the Ontario, Canada, rates the overcharges were \$1,382,000,000.

At the same time we are lagging far behind the rest of the civilized world in rural electrification. We only have 38 percent of the farm homes of America electrified, while the powers we are fighting against have an average of 90 percent of their farms electrified. At the same time the American farmer is appealing to us to get this service extended to every farm home in America and to get their rates reduced.

Ten years ago the Commonwealth Southern, of which Mr. Wendell L. Willkie is the latest graduate, was buying power from Muscle Shoals at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, and selling it to residential consumers within sight of the dam at 10 cents per kilowatt-hour. Last year the residential consumers of my home town paid 1 cent a kilowatt-hour for their electricity. Last year that power cost the residential consumers of my home town on an average 1 cent a kilowatt-hour, and where the power company was paying 2 mills a kilowatt-hour for this power wholesale we pay more than twice that amount.

Why should we permit this vast amount of wealth to flow to the seas unharnessed and to carry death, ruin, and destruction in its wake every year when, by the passage of proper legislation, and with the expenditure of less money than we are wasting on many other things, we could harness these rivers and protect everybody along these streams perpetually and at the same time give to America a wealth of power richer than the diamond mines of Golconda. We used last year less than 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste annually in these navigable streams and their tributaries.

Are we going to sit here and appropriate money for everything else on earth and see some of those funds we have appropriated used to build such

projects as the Shesaw Dam in Canada for the benefit of the Aluminum Trust?

Are we going to see lend-lease money used to build dams in other countries to furnish competition for us and to make the lives of the people in those countries more comfortable and their homes more attractive, while at the same time denying to the American people the use of this great wealth of hydroelectric power that belongs to them?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question and I am sure the gentleman can answer it. Does the Rural Electrification Authority have any intention whatever of creating with the funds we have been appropriating insurance companies to carry the insurance on the material and the property that they have?

Mr. RANKIN. That insurance question about which you have heard so much is a matter for the cooperatives themselves. They have the right to insure their property with anybody they please. They are not taking money out of the Federal Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. FISH. I wanted to know the facts.

Mr. RANKIN. That is a fact.

May I say to the gentleman from New York that right in his own back yard there is the great St. Lawrence project that would produce 10,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year. In my humble opinion, it would reduce the rates in the State of New York alone, just through the force of the yardstick, more than \$100,000,000 a year. Yet we come along and quibble about rural electrification trying to protect the farmers of this Nation in trying to insure their lines by the cheapest insurance they can get, and let this great wealth of power go to waste.

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by the residential users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 1.—Residential electric service, 1942

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama.....	262,462	349,202,000	\$9,134,800	\$6,184,260	\$2,950,540	\$5,581,363	\$3,553,437	\$5,106,353	\$4,028,447	\$4,823,174	\$4,311,626
Arizona.....	96,137	117,680,000	4,508,900	1,997,443	2,511,457	1,803,560	2,705,340	1,650,257	2,858,643	1,500,079	2,948,821
Arkansas.....	150,625	123,004,000	5,615,200	2,684,066	2,931,134	2,425,766	3,189,434	2,218,004	3,397,196	2,094,470	3,520,730
California.....	1,839,900	1,876,605,000	56,562,000	37,613,730	18,948,270	33,993,762	22,568,238	31,052,538	25,509,462	29,355,678	27,206,322
Colorado.....	217,270	194,901,000	8,053,100	4,396,993	3,656,107	3,970,178	4,082,922	3,631,948	4,421,152	3,430,621	4,622,479
Connecticut.....	472,439	521,297,000	19,994,400	10,617,026	9,377,374	9,577,318	10,417,082	8,757,547	11,236,853	8,277,682	11,716,718
Delaware.....	60,961	60,960,000	2,688,000	1,290,240	1,397,760	1,163,904	1,524,096	1,064,448	1,623,552	1,008,000	1,680,000
Dist. of Col.....	67,891	209,169,000	5,177,800	4,292,396	885,404	3,878,172	1,299,628	3,541,615	1,636,185	3,350,037	1,827,763
Florida.....	350,975	426,672,000	17,411,400	7,661,016	9,750,384	6,929,737	10,481,663	6,337,750	11,073,650	5,989,522	11,421,878
Georgia.....	383,695	485,145,000	15,294,100	9,262,931	6,041,169	8,365,873	6,928,227	7,649,050	7,645,050	7,234,109	8,059,991
Idaho.....	110,637	204,946,000	5,191,200	3,000,514	2,190,686	2,709,806	2,481,394	2,481,894	2,709,806	2,341,231	2,849,969
Illinois.....	1,849,955	1,817,960,000	69,688,500	39,861,822	29,826,678	36,028,955	33,659,545	32,892,972	36,795,528	31,081,071	38,607,429
Indiana.....	762,796	754,230,000	28,725,700	15,914,038	12,811,662	14,362,850	14,362,850	13,127,645	15,598,055	12,409,502	16,316,198
Iowa.....	479,103	446,734,000	18,686,300	9,771,621	8,894,679	8,838,620	9,847,680	8,072,482	10,613,818	7,642,697	11,043,603
Kansas.....	341,343	309,163,000	12,842,200	6,697,944	6,164,266	6,035,834	6,806,396	6,522,146	7,320,054	6,213,933	7,628,267
Kentucky.....	344,604	308,900,000	11,587,000	6,963,787	4,623,213	6,291,741	5,295,259	5,747,152	5,839,848	5,434,303	6,152,697

TABLE 1.—Residential electric service, 1942—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Louisiana.....	296,105	236,550,000	\$10,854,200	\$5,253,433	\$5,600,767	\$4,754,140	\$6,100,060	\$4,341,680	\$6,512,520	\$4,102,888	\$6,751,312
Maine.....	186,895	158,561,000	7,114,000	3,272,440	3,841,560	2,952,310	4,161,690	2,703,320	4,410,680	2,553,926	4,560,074
Maryland.....	470,929	359,224,000	13,380,800	7,827,768	5,553,032	7,065,062	6,315,738	6,462,926	6,917,874	6,115,026	7,265,774
Massachusetts.....	1,152,014	920,085,000	43,264,600	20,810,273	22,454,327	18,820,101	24,444,499	17,219,311	26,045,289	16,267,490	26,967,110
Michigan.....	1,342,654	1,641,918,000	50,634,300	32,051,512	18,582,828	28,012,185	21,722,115	26,431,105	24,203,195	25,013,344	25,620,956
Minnesota.....	543,552	607,094,000	21,439,100	12,498,995	8,940,105	11,276,967	10,162,133	10,312,207	11,126,893	9,754,791	11,684,309
Mississippi.....	150,454	147,467,000	4,748,200	2,639,999	2,108,201	2,383,596	2,364,604	2,170,883	2,568,317	2,060,719	2,667,481
Missouri.....	695,521	602,011,000	24,883,800	14,457,488	10,426,312	13,039,111	11,844,689	11,019,340	12,964,460	11,272,361	13,611,439
Montana.....	98,625	115,262,000	4,103,600	2,084,629	2,018,971	1,883,552	2,220,048	1,723,512	2,380,088	1,629,129	2,474,471
Nebraska.....	234,130	217,885,000	8,796,000	4,785,024	4,010,976	4,318,836	4,477,164	3,949,404	4,846,596	3,738,300	5,057,700
Nevada.....	26,142	35,253,000	1,336,100	618,614	717,486	558,490	777,610	510,390	482,332	853,768	853,768
New Hampshire.....	130,380	111,382,000	5,434,300	2,385,658	3,048,642	2,157,417	3,276,883	1,972,651	3,461,649	1,863,965	3,570,335
New Jersey.....	1,123,048	945,608,000	45,232,900	21,711,792	23,521,108	19,585,846	25,647,054	17,912,228	27,320,672	16,962,338	28,270,562
New Mexico.....	59,487	50,768,000	2,498,500	1,014,554	1,433,946	915,814	1,652,686	839,290	1,629,210	792,389	1,676,111
New York.....	3,506,955	2,841,238,000	128,037,500	64,412,923	63,644,577	58,266,163	69,791,337	53,271,930	74,785,580	50,326,598	77,730,902
North Carolina.....	407,588	437,757,000	15,025,700	8,759,983	6,265,717	7,903,518	7,122,182	7,227,362	7,798,338	6,836,694	8,189,006
North Dakota.....	71,711	71,522,000	3,008,300	1,446,992	1,561,308	1,308,611	1,699,689	1,197,303	1,810,967	1,131,121	1,877,179
Ohio.....	1,686,920	1,800,472,000	61,304,300	39,234,732	22,069,548	35,495,190	25,809,110	32,429,975	28,874,325	30,652,150	30,652,150
Oklahoma.....	303,306	241,190,000	11,625,600	5,522,160	6,103,440	4,987,382	6,038,218	4,568,861	7,050,739	4,313,098	7,312,502
Oregon.....	282,929	524,796,000	11,039,700	7,849,227	3,190,473	7,087,487	3,952,213	6,480,304	4,559,396	6,127,034	4,912,666
Pennsylvania.....	2,203,207	2,202,202,000	83,919,000	46,826,802	37,092,198	42,295,176	41,623,824	38,602,740	45,816,280	36,604,765	47,414,235
Rhode Island.....	187,735	131,941,000	6,855,300	3,146,583	3,708,717	2,838,694	4,017,206	2,598,159	4,257,141	2,454,197	4,401,103
South Carolina.....	106,246	120,772,000	6,845,800	4,162,246	2,683,554	3,768,344	3,087,456	3,409,208	3,409,208	3,251,755	3,904,045
South Dakota.....	76,022	71,758,000	3,140,000	1,485,220	1,654,780	1,340,780	1,799,220	1,224,600	1,915,400	1,158,690	1,981,240
Tennessee.....	383,691	586,626,000	12,412,300	10,016,720	2,395,574	9,048,567	3,863,733	8,279,004	4,133,296	7,819,749	9,492,551
Texas.....	930,574	785,774,000	33,438,700	17,154,053	16,284,647	15,515,557	17,623,143	14,178,009	19,260,691	13,408,919	20,029,781
Utah.....	137,150	157,238,000	5,172,300	2,948,211	2,224,089	2,653,734	2,508,596	2,436,153	2,736,147	2,301,674	2,570,626
Vermont.....	73,737	77,589,000	3,321,200	1,491,219	1,829,981	1,348,407	1,972,793	1,232,165	2,089,035	1,165,741	2,155,459
Virginia.....	412,047	452,617,000	17,101,300	9,268,905	7,832,395	8,379,637	8,721,663	7,661,382	9,430,618	7,233,550	9,867,450
Washington.....	491,374	998,364,000	18,292,600	14,103,495	4,189,105	12,749,942	5,542,658	6,640,214	6,440,214	11,012,145	7,280,455
West Virginia.....	273,670	228,011,000	9,228,200	5,057,054	4,171,146	4,567,959	4,660,241	4,171,146	5,057,054	3,949,670	5,278,530
Wisconsin.....	649,663	720,978,000	23,703,400	13,463,531	10,239,869	12,159,844	11,543,656	11,116,895	12,586,605	10,500,606	13,202,794
Wyoming.....	43,763	40,298,000	1,843,100	808,100	975,000	785,161	1,057,939	716,966	1,126,134	678,261	1,164,839
United States.....	26,620,456	26,936,773,000	990,185,300	556,830,188	433,355,112	503,080,419	487,104,881	459,812,470	530,372,830	434,681,794	555,503,506

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by commercial users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 2.—Commercial electric service, 1942

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total Revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	38,107	219,355,000	\$5,725,500	\$3,297,888	\$2,427,612	\$2,696,711	\$3,028,789	\$2,576,475	\$3,149,025	\$3,114,672	\$2,610,828
Arizona	15,581	98,982,000	3,064,600	1,360,682	1,703,918	1,109,385	1,955,215	1,063,416	2,001,184	1,284,067	1,780,533
Arkansas	34,365	121,251,000	4,609,500	1,954,428	2,655,072	1,594,887	3,014,613	1,521,135	3,088,365	1,470,431	3,139,609
California	357,160	3,425,247,000	58,611,900	37,101,333	21,510,567	30,302,352	28,309,548	28,895,667	29,716,233	34,991,304	23,620,596
Colorado	37,562	224,889,000	6,898,700	3,311,376	3,587,324	2,697,392	4,201,308	2,566,316	4,332,384	3,118,212	3,780,488
Connecticut	62,097	443,042,000	13,935,800	5,825,164	8,110,636	4,752,108	9,183,692	4,543,071	9,392,729	5,490,705	8,445,095
Delaware	8,916	48,863,000	1,435,300	647,320	787,980	528,190	907,110	505,226	930,074	610,003	825,297
Dist. of Col.	10,706	239,901,000	4,657,700	3,670,268	987,432	2,999,559	1,658,141	2,873,801	1,783,899	3,469,987	1,187,713
Florida	66,069	422,991,000	14,823,400	5,573,598	9,249,802	4,535,960	10,287,440	4,328,433	10,494,967	5,247,484	9,575,916
Georgia	63,313	402,195,000	12,949,800	6,241,804	6,707,996	5,089,271	7,860,529	4,869,125	8,080,675	5,892,159	7,057,641
Idaho	18,980	175,294,000	3,282,900	1,628,318	1,654,582	1,323,009	1,959,891	1,260,634	2,022,266	1,529,831	1,753,069
Illinois	248,833	1,434,019,000	49,100,000	23,469,800	25,630,200	19,198,100	29,901,900	18,412,500	30,687,500	22,193,200	26,906,800
Indiana	107,360	698,135,000	19,546,100	9,968,511	9,577,589	8,131,178	11,414,922	7,779,348	11,766,752	9,401,674	10,144,426
Iowa	95,499	535,692,000	16,076,600	8,263,372	7,813,228	6,752,172	9,324,428	6,462,793	9,613,807	7,781,074	8,295,526
Kansas	57,642	505,978,000	11,055,500	5,560,917	5,494,583	4,532,755	6,522,745	4,333,756	6,721,744	5,251,363	5,804,137
Kentucky	47,980	218,027,000	7,090,700	3,743,890	3,346,810	3,056,092	4,034,608	2,921,368	4,169,332	3,531,169	3,559,531
Louisiana	46,519	360,454,000	10,809,600	4,334,650	6,474,950	3,523,930	7,285,670	3,372,595	7,437,005	4,086,029	6,723,571
Maine	30,303	114,753,000	3,656,100	1,685,462	1,970,638	1,371,038	2,285,062	1,305,228	2,350,872	1,683,091	2,073,009
Maryland	74,266	412,005,000	12,036,400	6,607,984	5,428,416	5,404,344	6,632,056	5,175,652	6,860,748	6,246,892	5,789,608
Massachusetts	172,737	735,105,000	27,713,200	10,780,435	16,932,765	8,785,084	18,928,116	8,397,100	19,316,100	10,710,744	17,542,456
Michigan	167,517	1,356,991,000	36,941,500	18,840,165	18,101,335	15,367,664	21,573,836	14,702,717	22,238,783	15,958,728	20,982,772
Minnesota	101,590	523,254,000	17,649,000	8,206,785	9,442,215	6,688,971	10,960,029	6,371,289	11,277,711	7,730,262	9,918,738
Mississippi	29,483	140,324,000	4,733,100	2,021,034	2,712,066	1,647,119	3,085,981	1,571,389	3,161,711	1,902,706	2,830,394
Missouri	123,930	691,679,000	20,433,500	10,004,987	9,828,513	8,663,804	11,769,696	8,296,000	12,137,499	10,012,415	10,421,085
Montana	21,646	92,696,000	3,045,000	1,446,375	1,598,625	1,175,370	1,869,630	1,120,560	1,924,440	1,358,070	1,686,930
Nebraska	42,346	181,903,000	6,081,900	3,192,998	2,888,902	2,603,053	3,478,847	2,493,579	3,588,321	3,010,541	3,071,359
Nevada	5,158	74,718,000	1,331,200	593,715	737,485	484,557	846,643	403,258	867,942	560,435	770,765
New Hampshire	17,779	61,792,000	2,367,800	1,046,568	1,321,232	854,776	1,513,024	810,891	1,550,909	987,373	1,380,427
New Jersey	187,423	866,953,000	35,601,900	13,350,713	22,251,187	10,804,181	24,707,719	10,395,755	25,206,145	12,003,073	22,968,827
New Mexico	12,579	107,935,000	3,689,200	1,390,828	2,298,372	1,132,584	2,556,616	1,084,625	2,604,475	1,313,355	2,375,845
New York	600,144	3,940,139,000	131,908,200	52,496,464	79,048,736	42,870,165	89,088,035	41,155,358	90,752,842	49,597,483	82,310,717
North Carolina	74,036	415,674,000	11,211,400	6,233,538	4,977,862	5,078,764	6,132,636	4,854,536	6,356,864	5,874,774	5,336,626
North Dakota	21,259	74,032,000	3,074,600	1,282,108	1,792,492	1,042,289	2,032,311	999,245	2,075,355	1,205,243	1,869,357
Ohio	209,884	1,316,500,000	37,576,100	20,742,007	16,834,093	16,946,821	20,629,279	16,232,575	21,343,225	19,614,724	17,961,376
Oklahoma	52,861	217,222,000	7,844,200	3,529,890	4,314,310	3,750,977	4,973,223	2,737,626	5,106,574	3,318,097	4,526,103
Oregon	43,271	427,311,000	7,462,600	4,417,859	3,044,741	3,604,435	3,858,164	3,447,721	4,014,879	4,164,131	3,298,409
Pennsylvania	312,847	1,536,607,000	44,547,800	22,733,900	22,273,000	18,220,050	26,327,750	17,418,190	27,129,610	21,026,662	23,521,238
Rhode Island	24,624	94,734,000	4,153,900	1,690,637	2,463,263	1,374,941	2,778,959	1,308,479	2,845,421	1,586,790	2,567,110
South Carolina	35,647	200,140,000	5,108,000	2,742,996	2,365,004	2,237,304	2,870,696	2,135,144	2,972,556	2,584,648	2,923,352
South Dakota	21,500	81,847,000	3,122,200	1,323,813	1,798,387	1,080,281	2,041,919	1,030,326	2,091,874	1,248,880	1,873,320
Tennessee	53,169	342,360,000	6,989,300	5,207,029	1,782,271	4,249,494	2,739,806	4,060,783	2,928,517	4,913,478	2,075,822
Texas	161,975	1,195,318,000	30,100,700	14,663,911	15,446,789	11,953,948	18,156,752	11,442,066	18,668,634	13,820,811	16,289,889
Utah	14,804	105,401,000	3,073,200	1,410,599	1,662,601	1,149,377	1,923,823	1,097,132	1,976,068	1,327,622	1,745,578
Vermont	11,705	50,398,000	1,636,800	730,013	906,787	594,158	1,042,642	564,696	1,072,104	687,456	949,944
Virginia	63,607	432,389,000	12,046,400	5,649,762	6,396,638	4,613,771	7,432,629	4,421,029	7,625,371	5,336,555	6,709,845
Washington	64,301	576,056,000	12,789,700	8,837,683	3,952,017	7,213,391	5,576,309	6,907,438	5,883,262	8,338,884	4,450,816
West Virginia	37,724	156,365,000	5,308,800	2,691,562	2,197,238	2,197,843	3,110,957	2,123,620	3,185,280	2,542,915	2,765,885
Wisconsin	106,509	725,961,000	18,754,700	10,052,519	8,702,181	8,214,559	10,540,141	7,588,219	10,896,481	9,489,878	9,264,822
Wyoming	6,153	46,541,000	1,606,900	707,036	890,864	575,270	1,031,630	549,560	1,057,340	665,257	941,643
United States	4,219,457	27,233,420,000	767,278,900	372,407,694	394,871,206	303,983,435	463,295,465	290,822,646	476,456,254	349,245,237	418,033,063

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by industrial users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 3.—Industrial and other electric service, 1942

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama.....	40,372	3,125,357,000	\$22,303,300	\$16,415,229	\$5,888,071	\$10,259,518	\$12,043,782	\$12,088,389	\$10,214,911	\$15,255,457	\$7,047,843
Arizona.....	2,024	487,340,000	5,190,900	2,616,214	2,574,686	1,635,134	3,555,766	1,925,824	3,265,076	2,429,341	2,761,559
Arkansas.....	28,310	438,890,000	6,586,300	4,307,440	2,278,860	2,693,797	3,802,503	3,174,597	3,411,703	4,004,470	2,581,830
California.....	800,385	6,794,045,000	83,061,300	77,066,216	5,395,084	48,555,761	34,445,539	67,934,907	25,066,393	72,128,130	10,873,170
Colorado.....	23,170	428,031,000	7,007,900	4,218,756	2,789,144	2,634,970	4,372,930	3,104,500	3,963,400	3,917,416	3,090,484
Connecticut.....	7,402	1,454,493,000	20,000,700	12,620,442	7,380,258	7,880,276	12,120,424	9,300,326	10,700,374	11,720,410	8,280,290
Delaware.....	1,627	235,635,000	2,761,500	1,830,875	930,625	1,143,261	1,618,239	1,347,612	1,413,888	1,701,084	1,060,416
Dist. of Col.....	3,750	990,372,000	7,833,400	5,008,714	2,224,686	3,501,530	4,331,870	4,128,202	3,705,198	5,209,211	2,624,189
Florida.....	5,216	413,347,000	7,904,100	4,307,735	3,596,365	2,687,394	5,216,706	3,169,544	4,734,556	3,999,475	3,904,625
Georgia.....	3,982	1,567,527,000	14,299,800	10,224,357	4,075,443	6,392,011	7,907,789	7,535,995	6,763,805	9,495,067	4,804,733
Idaho.....	6,868	401,231,000	2,944,100	2,240,460	703,640	1,401,392	1,542,708	1,648,696	1,295,404	2,081,479	862,621
Illinois.....	82,919	7,145,238,000	86,736,000	49,873,200	36,862,800	31,224,960	55,511,040	36,776,064	49,959,936	46,317,024	40,418,976
Indiana.....	79,562	2,834,623,000	36,792,600	23,179,338	13,613,262	14,496,284	22,296,316	17,071,766	19,720,834	21,523,671	15,268,929
Iowa.....	44,417	1,034,869,000	11,973,000	7,686,666	4,286,334	4,801,173	7,171,827	5,663,229	6,309,771	7,147,881	4,825,119
Kansas.....	26,902	559,480,000	7,990,200	5,349,458	2,646,742	2,646,742	4,653,788	3,942,127	4,054,073	4,965,640	3,030,560
Kentucky.....	22,783	1,151,071,000	14,125,900	9,308,902	4,816,998	5,819,830	8,305,970	6,851,013	7,274,787	8,644,990	5,480,810
Louisiana.....	6,583	1,048,331,000	8,484,900	3,201,260	3,201,260	3,809,839	5,615,061	4,562,237	4,922,663	5,757,334	3,727,506
Maine.....	16,047	701,918,000	7,920,800	5,242,259	2,688,541	3,275,420	4,655,380	3,802,300	4,068,500	4,869,511	3,061,289
Maryland.....	26,005	1,700,855,000	20,243,200	12,247,136	7,996,064	7,651,920	12,591,270	9,008,224	11,234,976	11,370,678	8,866,522
Massachusetts.....	7,477	2,667,659,000	42,471,000	25,227,774	17,243,226	15,756,741	26,714,259	18,559,827	23,911,173	23,443,992	19,027,008
Michigan.....	19,412	4,098,897,000	46,703,100	25,780,111	20,922,989	16,112,670	30,500,530	18,961,469	27,741,641	23,958,690	22,744,410
Minnesota.....	20,891	1,109,388,000	15,923,000	9,967,798	6,955,202	6,225,893	9,697,107	7,340,034	8,582,407	9,251,263	6,671,737
Mississippi.....	13,442	3,772,720,000	5,302,000	3,366,770	1,935,230	2,104,894	3,197,106	2,476,034	2,825,960	3,122,878	2,179,122
Missouri.....	84,721	2,105,949,000	23,331,500	16,355,382	6,976,118	10,219,197	13,112,303	11,292,446	11,292,446	15,188,807	8,142,693
Montana.....	2,226	1,528,762,000	8,522,400	7,150,294	1,372,106	4,465,738	4,056,662	5,266,843	3,255,557	6,638,050	1,883,450
Nebraska.....	12,686	373,903,000	5,095,400	3,480,158	1,615,242	2,175,736	2,919,664	2,562,986	2,532,414	3,230,484	1,864,016
Nevada.....	133	44,758,000	609,800	499,426	110,374	312,218	297,582	367,709	242,001	464,058	145,742
New Hampshire.....	3,073	314,730,000	4,533,500	3,078,247	1,455,253	1,922,204	2,611,206	2,266,750	2,266,750	2,860,639	1,672,861
New Jersey.....	4,820	3,187,891,000	38,418,500	22,628,497	15,790,003	14,138,008	24,280,492	16,673,629	21,744,871	21,014,920	17,405,580
New Mexico.....	344	19,444,000	441,500	211,037	230,463	132,009	309,491	155,408	286,092	190,026	245,474
New York.....	22,120	11,648,360,000	101,452,900	59,045,588	42,407,312	36,928,856	64,524,044	43,523,294	57,929,606	54,886,019	46,566,881
North Carolina.....	29,630	2,646,290,000	25,935,900	19,815,027	6,120,873	12,371,424	13,564,476	14,601,912	11,333,988	18,414,489	7,521,411
North Dakota.....	2,739	34,724,000	925,300	506,139	419,161	316,453	608,847	372,896	552,404	470,052	455,248
Ohio.....	100,844	8,020,198,000	84,353,000	53,985,920	30,367,080	33,741,200	50,611,800	39,730,263	44,622,737	50,190,035	34,162,965
Oklahoma.....	24,251	803,171,000	10,890,100	7,263,697	3,626,403	4,541,172	6,348,928	5,357,929	5,532,172	6,751,862	4,138,238
Oregon.....	13,009	1,064,051,000	7,968,900	7,076,383	892,517	4,422,740	5,546,160	5,211,661	2,757,289	6,574,343	1,394,557
Pennsylvania.....	56,775	11,961,631,000	120,569,900	84,760,640	35,809,260	52,930,186	67,639,714	62,455,208	58,114,962	78,732,145	41,837,755
Rhode Island.....	1,410	580,420,000	8,997,200	5,515,284	3,481,916	3,445,928	5,551,272	4,066,734	4,390,466	5,128,404	3,868,796
South Carolina.....	14,267	1,274,139,000	11,816,500	9,039,623	2,776,877	5,648,287	6,168,213	6,652,690	5,163,810	8,401,632	3,414,968
South Dakota.....	1,987	69,532,000	1,570,300	832,259	738,041	519,769	1,050,531	612,417	957,883	772,758	707,712
Tennessee.....	14,538	3,904,715,000	20,781,400	18,567,790	2,223,610	11,596,021	9,185,379	13,674,161	7,107,239	17,248,662	3,532,838
Texas.....	82,391	2,015,775,000	31,646,900	20,855,307	10,791,593	13,088,623	18,608,377	15,380,393	16,266,507	19,367,903	12,278,997
Utah.....	3,380	854,879,000	7,105,900	5,073,613	2,032,287	3,169,231	3,936,669	3,737,703	3,368,197	4,711,212	2,394,688
Vermont.....	6,203	171,946,000	2,922,700	2,124,803	797,897	1,329,829	1,592,871	1,566,567	1,356,133	1,975,745	946,955
Virginia.....	15,575	1,318,548,000	14,516,300	10,190,443	4,325,857	6,372,656	8,143,644	7,504,927	7,011,373	9,464,628	5,051,672
Washington.....	29,229	4,378,781,000	24,206,800	20,212,678	3,994,122	12,635,950	11,570,850	14,887,182	9,319,618	18,784,477	5,422,323
West Virginia.....	24,592	2,368,446,000	23,104,700	15,526,368	7,578,342	9,703,974	13,400,726	11,436,827	11,667,873	14,417,333	8,687,367
Wisconsin.....	77,266	1,933,118,000	26,604,700	16,069,289	10,535,461	10,556,877	16,548,123	11,839,092	14,765,608	14,925,237	11,679,463
Wyoming.....	1,579	57,794,000	1,006,300	562,522	443,778	351,199	655,101	414,596	591,704	522,270	484,030
United States.....	1,369,334	104,163,272,000	1,092,843,200	735,835,844	357,007,356	450,952,075	632,891,125	542,792,206	550,050,994	683,653,812	409,189,398

Here are the total overcharges, by States, for all users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 4.—Total electric sales, 1942

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama.....	340,941	3,693,914,000	\$37,163,600	\$25,897,377	\$11,286,223	\$18,537,592	\$18,626,008	\$19,771,217	\$17,392,383	\$23,193,303	\$13,970,297
Arizona.....	113,742	704,002,000	12,764,400	5,974,339	6,790,061	4,548,079	8,216,321	4,639,497	8,124,903	5,273,487	7,490,913
Arkansas.....	213,300	683,145,000	16,811,000	8,945,934	7,865,066	6,714,450	10,096,550	6,913,736	9,897,264	7,569,371	9,241,629
California.....	2,497,445	12,005,897,000	198,175,200	152,321,279	45,853,921	112,851,875	85,323,325	117,883,112	80,292,088	136,475,112	61,700,088
Colorado.....	278,002	847,821,000	21,959,700	11,927,125	10,032,675	9,302,540	12,657,160	9,302,764	12,656,936	10,466,249	11,493,451
Connecticut.....	541,938	2,418,832,000	53,930,900	29,062,632	24,868,268	22,209,702	31,721,198	22,600,944	31,329,956	25,488,797	28,442,103
Delaware.....	71,504	345,458,000	6,884,800	3,768,434	3,116,365	2,835,355	4,049,445	2,917,286	3,967,514	3,319,087	3,565,713
Dist. of Col.....	82,347	1,439,442,000	17,668,900	13,571,378	4,097,522	10,379,261	7,289,639	10,543,618	7,125,282	12,029,235	5,639,665
Florida.....	422,260	1,263,010,000	40,138,900	17,542,349	22,596,551	14,153,091	25,985,809	13,835,727	26,303,173	15,236,481	24,902,419
Georgia.....	450,990	2,512,867,000	42,543,700	25,719,092	16,824,608	19,847,155	22,696,545	20,054,170	22,489,530	22,621,335	19,922,365
Idaho.....	135,885	781,471,000	11,418,200	6,869,292	4,548,908	5,434,207	5,983,993	5,390,724	6,027,476	5,952,541	5,465,569
Illinois.....	2,181,707	10,397,217,000	205,524,500	113,204,822	92,319,678	86,452,015	119,072,485	88,081,536	117,442,964	99,501,295	105,933,205
Indiana.....	949,718	4,286,988,000	85,064,400	49,061,887	36,002,613	36,990,312	48,074,088	37,978,759	47,085,641	43,334,847	41,729,553
Iowa.....	619,019	2,017,295,000	46,735,900	25,741,659	20,994,241	20,391,965	26,343,935	20,198,504	26,537,396	22,571,652	24,164,248
Kansas.....	425,887	1,374,621,000	31,893,900	17,588,319	14,305,581	13,911,001	17,982,899	13,798,029	18,095,871	15,430,936	16,462,964
Kentucky.....	415,367	1,677,998,000	32,803,500	20,016,579	12,786,921	15,167,663	17,635,837	15,519,533	17,283,967	17,610,462	15,193,038
Louisiana.....	349,207	1,645,335,000	31,148,700	15,781,723	15,366,977	12,147,909	19,000,791	12,276,512	18,872,188	13,946,251	17,202,449
Maine.....	233,245	975,232,000	18,700,900	10,200,161	8,500,739	7,698,768	11,102,132	7,870,848	10,830,052	9,006,528	9,994,528
Maryland.....	571,200	2,472,084,000	45,660,400	26,832,888	18,977,512	20,121,336	25,539,064	20,646,302	25,013,598	23,738,596	21,621,804
Massachusetts.....	1,332,228	4,322,849,000	113,448,800	56,818,482	56,639,318	43,361,926	76,086,874	44,176,328	69,272,822	49,882,262	63,566,574
Michigan.....	1,529,583	7,097,806,000	134,278,900	76,671,788	57,607,112	60,392,419	73,886,481	60,005,281	74,183,619	64,930,752	69,348,138
Minnesota.....	666,033	2,239,736,000	55,011,100	30,673,578	23,337,522	24,191,831	30,819,269	24,023,999	30,987,101	26,736,316	28,274,784
Mississippi.....	193,379	666,511,000	14,783,300	8,027,803	6,755,497	6,135,609	8,647,691	6,227,306	8,555,994	7,696,967	7,993,975
Missouri.....	854,172	3,489,639,000	68,648,800	41,417,857	27,230,943	31,922,112	36,726,688	32,376,195	36,272,605	36,473,583	32,175,217
Montana.....	122,497	1,736,720,000	15,671,000	10,681,298	4,989,702	7,524,660	8,146,340	8,110,915	7,560,085	9,626,149	6,044,851
Nebraska.....	289,162	773,693,000	19,973,300	11,458,180	8,515,120	9,097,625	10,875,675	9,005,969	10,967,331	9,979,325	9,993,975
Nevada.....	31,433	154,729,000	3,277,100	1,711,753	1,565,345	1,355,265	1,921,385	1,341,357	1,935,743	1,506,825	1,770,275
New Hampshire.....	151,232	487,904,000	12,335,600	6,510,473	5,825,127	4,934,397	7,401,203	5,056,292	7,279,308	5,171,977	6,623,623
New Jersey.....	1,315,291	5,000,452,000	119,253,300	57,691,002	61,562,298	44,618,035	74,635,265	44,981,612	74,271,688	50,580,331	68,672,969
New Mexico.....	72,410	178,147,000	6,599,200	2,616,419	3,982,781	2,180,407	4,418,793	4,079,323	4,519,877	2,301,770	4,297,430
New York.....	4,129,219	18,429,737,000	361,418,600	175,957,975	185,460,625	138,065,184	223,353,416	137,950,572	223,468,028	154,810,100	206,608,000
North Carolina.....	611,254	3,499,721,000	62,173,000	34,808,548	17,364,452	25,353,706	26,819,294	26,683,810	25,489,190	31,125,957	21,047,043

TABLE 4.—Total electric sales, 1942—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
North Dakota.....	95,700	180,278,000	\$7,008,200	\$3,235,239	\$3,772,961	\$2,667,353	\$4,340,847	\$2,560,444	\$4,438,756	\$2,806,416	\$4,201,784
Ohio.....	1,907,648	11,137,170,000	183,233,400	113,962,679	69,270,721	86,183,211	97,050,189	88,393,113	94,840,287	100,456,909	82,776,491
Oklahoma.....	380,418	1,261,583,000	30,359,900	16,315,747	14,044,153	12,399,531	17,990,369	12,664,416	17,095,484	14,383,057	15,970,843
Oregon.....	339,209	2,016,158,000	26,471,200	19,343,469	7,127,731	15,114,663	11,350,537	15,139,686	11,331,514	16,865,508	9,605,492
Pennsylvania.....	2,572,829	15,700,440,000	249,036,700	153,861,342	95,177,731	113,445,412	135,591,288	118,476,138	130,560,562	136,263,472	112,773,228
Rhode Island.....	213,769	807,051,000	20,006,400	10,352,504	7,653,896	7,658,963	12,347,437	7,973,372	12,033,028	9,169,391	10,837,009
South Carolina.....	246,160	1,685,051,000	23,770,300	15,944,865	7,825,435	11,643,935	12,126,365	12,224,426	11,545,874	14,237,935	9,532,365
South Dakota.....	99,509	223,137,000	7,832,500	3,641,292	4,191,208	2,940,830	4,891,670	2,867,343	4,965,157	3,180,128	4,652,372
Tennessee.....	451,398	4,833,695,000	40,183,000	33,781,545	6,401,455	24,894,082	15,288,918	26,013,948	14,169,052	29,981,789	10,201,211
Texas.....	1,174,940	4,716,867,000	95,196,300	52,673,271	42,523,029	40,508,028	54,688,272	41,000,468	54,195,832	46,597,633	48,598,667
Utah.....	155,343	1,117,518,000	15,351,400	9,432,423	5,918,977	6,982,342	8,369,058	7,270,988	8,080,412	8,340,508	7,010,892
Vermont.....	93,645	299,933,000	7,880,700	4,346,035	3,534,665	3,272,394	4,608,396	3,363,428	4,517,272	3,828,942	4,051,758
Virginia.....	491,229	2,203,554,000	43,664,000	25,109,110	18,554,890	19,366,064	24,297,936	19,587,338	24,076,662	22,035,033	21,628,967
Washington.....	584,904	6,253,201,000	55,280,100	43,153,856	12,135,244	32,599,283	22,689,817	33,446,006	21,843,094	38,135,506	17,153,594
West Virginia.....	335,986	2,752,822,000	37,641,700	23,274,974	14,366,726	16,469,776	21,171,924	17,731,493	19,910,207	20,909,918	16,731,782
Wisconsin.....	833,468	3,380,057,000	69,062,800	39,585,289	29,477,511	30,430,980	38,631,820	30,814,206	38,248,594	34,915,721	34,147,079
Wyoming.....	51,495	144,633,000	4,456,300	2,137,658	2,318,642	1,711,630	2,744,670	1,681,122	2,775,178	1,865,788	2,590,512
United States.....	32,209,247	158,333,465,000	2,850,307,400	1,665,073,726	1,185,233,674	1,267,015,929	1,583,291,471	1,293,549,122	1,556,758,278	1,467,580,843	1,382,726,557

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3010), was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend the remarks I have previously made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that the report of the House Flood Control Committee is rather full and will give the Members full information with reference to the emergency measure, the provisions of the bill, and the damages on the various rivers of the country.

#### APPOINTMENTS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from Indiana briefly state for the RECORD the purpose of the bill?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide in the case of cadets and midshipmen at either the Military or the Naval Academy, or nominees thereto,

whose legal residence, by reason of redistricting the State, falls in a new congressional district, that such cadets, midshipmen, and nominees be charged to the new district, but to preserve the number of appointments otherwise authorized from the new district by temporarily increasing such number in an amount equal to the newly acquired cadets, midshipmen, and nominees.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the fact that I am one of the beneficiaries of this bill, I simply wanted a statement for the RECORD. I shall be very pleased to see this bill pass.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This merely preserves to the Member of Congress the statutory right he now has.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That cadets at the United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, or nominees for appointment thereto, whose place of residence, by reason of redistricting the State concerned, falls in another congressional district, and who were appointed with respect to or nominated by the Representative of the former district, shall be charged to the Representative of the latter district, but the number of cadets and midshipmen, respectively, allowed at such respective academies for the Representative of such latter district shall be increased by the number of such cadets or midshipmen, as the case may be, and by the number of such nominees who are appointed and qualify.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, at the end of line 9, strike out the comma and insert "as additional numbers."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the commas, and after "midshipmen", insert "otherwise."

Page 2, line 4, after "be" insert "temporarily."

Page 2, line 6, after "qualify", insert "Provided, That such temporary increase in numbers authorized herein for the Representative concerned shall be reduced accordingly as each cadet or midshipman, in attendance at either academy under an appointment from such former district is finally separated therefrom."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE HONORABLE JESSE JONES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, we are informed by the press that another controversy has arisen between the departments of the Government, and the critics are snapping at the heels of the great Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any man in the Government who has protected the interests of the American people it is Jesse Jones. It may be all right to open the doors of the Treasury with leasehold money to finance our allies in the fight for civilization, but when it comes to opening the Treasury and removing all restrictions in paying out money to foreigners in dealing with the tricksters of other countries, in their schemes to profit at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States, as proposed by these critics, I say the American people will be found squarely behind Jesse Jones.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] just a few moments ago stated that the blame for the failure to pass certain legislation rested upon the Congress and not upon the administration. Certainly he did not have in mind any fancied failure of Congress to adopt the Smith-Connally bill, or of the House to pass the Hobbs bill, or of the House to pass the Smith bill, which has been over on the other side for a couple of years. The House did not fail on any of those bills and each was opposed by the administration. It seems to me it is rather unkind for the gentleman from Texas to lay the blame on Congress, especially when the Members on the majority side for more than 8 years have been swallowing all this legislation which now appears to give them a stomach ache. I say you should not criticize the House for gulping down that New Deal legislation which is now bringing disaster. You asked for it. You forced it through the House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was one of the most insistent, yet now he blames the House because it followed the President in his legislative program.

I notice the majority leader is here today, as usual. He frequently, or sometimes—I will put it that way—he sometimes weeps and grieves publicly from the well of the House because I criticize some New Deal fallacy. I hope the gentleman will take occasion to remonstrate privately and off the record and confidentially with HENRY WALLACE and Jesse Jones to end their name calling, their charges of incompetency and worse leveled at each other, because I might be tempted to follow their example of criticizing something in the administration.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an editorial by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an article by William Henry Chamberlain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, July 7, after the legislative business and

any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADDITIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 271, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) to increase by \$300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 2975, calling for authorization of an additional \$300,000,000 for housing. I presume the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], will be in a position to furnish the House the information that I have been unable to obtain, namely, where this money is needed. The President, the War Department, and the Navy Department say they feel that the appropriation is absolutely necessary.

Realizing the need for the housing, we reported the rule, feeling that the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will be in a position to give that information, which, as I said, I have been unable to obtain. Up to this time we have authorized and appropriated \$1,200,000,000 for war housing. This additional \$300,000,000 will make \$1,500,000,000. That is in addition to the \$500,000,000 which has been authorized by the Congress for the various housing facilities and services needed in the various sections of the country where this housing became necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I want it understood that I am in favor of the rule and the bill, but I feel it my duty to again call attention to what I believe to have been extreme recklessness and to the fact that a great deal of money could have been saved if the War Department had used better judgment than to build these great plants far removed from populated sections, which now makes necessary the additional housing. Had the plants that were already available in many sections been utilized, I am sure that more than half of this tremendous sum for housing could have been saved.

The Corps of Engineers in the War Department appointed, as I am informed, a site committee that selected the sites for these plants, and I firmly feel that they were imposed upon and their judgment warped by the conniving of real-estate operators in the selection of sites.

The administration in many instances is criticized for this tremendous expenditure and for constructing these plants away from the populated sections where labor and transportation and all these facilities were available. This criticism, I feel, should be directed against the Corps of Engineers, or those responsible for the lack of foresight and abuse of power in the selection of sites.

I am convinced that if the Construction Division had remained under the supervision and direction of the able Quartermaster General, Edmund B. Gregory, millions upon millions could have been saved to the Government, but, unfortunately, the influential gentlemen representing the big interests forced the taking away of the Construction Division from the jurisdiction of Quartermaster General Gregory and placed it under the direct jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. This was immediately after General Gregory, apparently questioning the activities of some officers and officials cooperating with his division in certain transactions, "cleaned house" to prevent misuse of power or favoritism in the awarding of construction contracts and the acquisition of sites. I feel that if the President had had the time to penetrate the underlying reasons for this transfer he would not have sanctioned it.

Personally, I feel that the President, instead of being criticized, should be sympathized with because, due to the insistent demands of the Republican press and the Republicans in general, that he appoint Republicans in his Cabinet, he appointed to the two most important positions the Republican Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, who was Secretary of State under President Hoover, and later the Republican candidate for Vice President, Mr. Knox, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Many well-informed persons are of the opinion that if better judgment had been used and economy practiced by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, we would have saved in this respect alone millions upon millions of dollars. I know that some of the plants that have been constructed will never be used.

You and I have received many complaints from sections where hundreds upon hundreds of farmers have been dispossessed of their rich farm lands, thereby reducing the production of foodstuffs which is sadly needed now, when they could have selected desirable sites, better suited, at much lower cost and closer to the populated sections of our country, where there was plenty of housing, where we had facilities, and to which it was not necessary to build highways, or to build sewers or water mains, construct schools and other needed facilities to make life possible in the new towns which, after a few years, will be nothing more nor less than ghost towns; and this at a tremendous, wicked, and unnecessary cost to the Government.

I do not want to detain the House by reading some reports and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include some short excerpts from statements appearing in newspapers on some of these subjects; also statements made by the majority whip, Mr. Ramspeck, relative to the fraud of which some of the officers have been guilty; and also a report on the vast acreage that has been unnecessarily purchased at tremendous prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, is there anything in there about housing in Detroit and the way the housing proposition was handled?

Mr. SABATH. Nothing that I know of.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no objection, then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I have a great deal of information on the situation in Detroit and elsewhere in Michigan, and right there I am reminded, due to the question propounded by the gentleman from Michigan, that millions upon millions have been wasted on the Ford plant in Willow Run and several other plants in the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert an article relative to the abandonment of a mammoth plant but recently completely at a cost of \$30,000,000 near Amarillo, Tex., which was fully equipped with expensive machinery and ready to go into operation:

**UNITED STATES MYSTERIOUSLY ABANDONS COSTLY AMMONIA INSTALLATION**

AMARILLO, TEX., June 26—"No longer required" is the only explanation given by the War Department for suddenly closing down its mammoth Cactus ordnance works, an ammonia plant reputed to have cost around \$30,000,000 and originally scheduled to start production within the next week or two.

A spokesman for the Department said in Washington it has been decided that the plant, which was under construction for more than a year, is not needed now and that it soon will be sold to a private corporation or a foreign government. No other details were forthcoming.

I feel that Congress and the country are entitled to know the reasons for the building and shutting down of this plant.

Mr. Speaker, here I insert another extract from an article setting forth how the Frauds Division of the Department of Justice, under the direction of Tom Clark, is doing effective work of investigation of frauds in connection with war construction, and I hope they will continue their good work.

**FORT BELVOIR OFFICER, FIVE OTHERS, ACCUSED IN HUGE FRAUD CASE—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT CHARGES CONSPIRACY IN BUILDING HOOSIER PLANT**

The Justice Department announced today that a Federal grand jury at Indianapolis had indicted six persons, including a lieutenant colonel in the Army Engineer Corps, on charges of conspiring to overcharge the Government \$190,000 on rental of equipment used in building the Hoosier ordnance plant near Charlestown, Ind.

Attorney General Biddle said that the charge involved collection by the defendants

of \$335,000 in rentals and recapture charges compared with approximately \$145,000 which the equipment would have cost the Government had other contractors been dealt with, but that information obtained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicated total overcharges of around \$600,000 as a result of the alleged conspiracy.

Purchases of vast acreages by the War Department have been questioned and reports indicate that some of these purchases have been unnecessary. I insert here a newspaper report in that connection:

**VAST ACREAGE BOUGHT BY ARMY**

War needs of the Army in the last 2 years have made necessary the purchase of 137,450 acres of land and several buildings in the Sixth Service Command at a cost of more than \$29,000,000, the Great Lakes division of the Army's Corps of Engineers announced yesterday.

Officers said that figures on the size of the Army's holdings in the three-State command—Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan—prior to the war-purchasing program were not available, but that the buying more than doubled the amount of Army-held property in this area.

The engineers included in their purchases the Stevens and Chicago Beach Hotels and the Battle Creek (Mich.) Sanitarium, which was converted into the Percy Jones General Hospital. They said they bought 2,580 separate parcels of land ranging in size from 1 to 680 acres.

The engineers do all the property buying for the Army. All told, yesterday's announcement said, the Army now sprawls over 32,000 square miles of land in this country. This includes camps, airports, bombing and artillery ranges, depots, storage yards, and munition dumps.

Mr. Speaker, the War Department had been warned by me and others whose judgment should have been taken that some of these plants should not have been constructed, especially the Willow Run plant.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] appeared before the committee, after having made investigations of some of these projects, and, although the committee felt that it should hold executive sessions, yet he was permitted to testify and has furnished the committee with valuable information in support of the charges he has made.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana. He is the gentleman to whom I was referring.

Mr. WILSON. Since the gentleman from Illinois has referred to that particular situation I would like to make this observation. I was asked to appear before the Rules Committee by the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, and I came prepared to issue a statement which I thought the committee would be glad to hear and should hear. I expect to utilize what opportunity is given me today on the floor of the House to give such information to this committee as I have on hand.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I want to conclude my remarks, because I have a few more matters that I feel I should call to the attention of the House.

And lest I forget, I want it to be understood that the men now in charge of the housing work—Mr. Blandford and the men with him, Mr. Emmerich and Mr. Ferguson—appeared and testified before our committee in executive session, and we cross-examined them thoroughly; and I am convinced that they are extremely able, capable, and sincere men and certainly desirous of doing the right thing in protecting the interests of the Government. But unfortunately they are placed in an embarrassing position. The War and the Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission demand this housing. Housing officials are obliged to carry out the wishes of these agencies, and, though they have in some instances cut down the number of housing units requested, still they cannot completely ignore the housing demands of these agencies.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Not now; I am sure the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. Speaker, one more thing that has been annoying me, and I presume it is annoying to many others, is the recklessness with which some of these properties have been injudiciously purchased and acquired, including the taking over of about 400 or 500 hotels, including the Stevens in Chicago, the largest in the world, which are now being abandoned and offered for sale. I presume at that time the departments needed these hotels. I even defended the purchase of the Stevens Hotel in Chicago because I believed the price for which they acquired it was very low—\$6,000,000—considering that it originally cost \$28,000,000.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Just to avoid any confusion I hope the gentleman will also state that the money for the purchase of these various hotels did not come in any way from the appropriations authorized by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SABATH. From what fund did this money come?

Mr. LANHAM. I assume from money turned over to the War Department. These hotels are used for offices of various kinds. This appropriation we have before us today has to do with living quarters for the industrial workers at the various plants.

Mr. SABATH. Correct. I thank the gentleman for making that clear. Nevertheless it was out of Government money.

The Stevens Hotel was taken over about a year ago; and only 3 months ago they sold all of the furnishings, and within a few weeks thereafter they announced they were going to abandon the hotel. People interested urged the War Department not to sell the furnishings, because it would be impossible for anybody to take back the building and obtain new furnishings so that the hotel could be reopened. Those furnishings

could have been stored for only \$3,000 a month, which would have cost \$9,000. By selling the furniture and furnishings, it will cost the Government over \$2,000,000 to refurnish.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many instances of reckless expenditures and reckless actions by key officials of the War and the Navy Departments in connection with the purchasing and constructing of buildings, that I feel they should even at this late date be informed that the House expects more judicious and economical action from them. We are obliged to appropriate billions of dollars gathered by taxing the American people. Yet the War Department expends the money so recklessly as to border on its being criminal.

The Department asked for \$35,000,000 to construct the Pentagon Building here in Washington, which amount we gave; but before the building was half completed an additional \$35,000,000 or even a larger sum was needed. Unfortunately, the President is being charged with the excessive expenditure, when, as a matter of fact, we all know that it was and is humanly impossible for him to give these matters the time they require. He in good faith appointed these outstanding Republicans to these important places and they in turn appointed other substitute Republicans to carry on. The Secretary, the Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and their subordinates, especially those who have been made officers from civil life and who have been placed in positions beyond their capacities, should be charged with and blamed for the reckless expenditures that have been made.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does not the gentleman think the President ought to know better than to monkey with these Republicans?

Mr. SABATH. I do not think he is monkeying with them; I think they have imposed on him.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But he appointed them.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I said that he appointed them, because he believed they were the outstanding Republicans, who would have the interests of the country at heart, and upon whom he could rely to aid him in his tremendous tasks. It was rumored that the President even offered a Cabinet position to a former Republican candidate for President, whose name I cannot recollect at this moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean Mr. Landon?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; he is the gentleman whose name I momentarily could not recall. Personally, I do not know whether the President could at that time or at any other time have found more outstanding Republicans than these two gentlemen, but, unfortunately, as Republicans they are not in accord with his own views and known policies. They are inclined to follow the viewpoints of the big interests, while it is the President's aim to aid the common people and protect the taxpayer. But I appreciate the

viewpoint of the gentleman from Texas. His opinion is cherished by a vast majority of the President's friends that many Republicans have been appointed by the President who are not in accord with his views.

We read only a few days ago that one Mr. Chester Davis who was honored by appointment to high position by the President resigned because he could not have his own way, which was not for the best interests of the country at large and not in accord with the President's policies. Yes; he appointed many other Republicans, unfortunately, I will say, and he and the country would be better off had he appointed loyal and able Democrats in their stead who would not have played politics and tried to undermine him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Illinois, and Chicago I assume, referred to Secretary Knox and to Secretary Stimson, who, he claims, have been monkeying with the President. Does not the gentleman think he should now get rid of them?

Mr. SABATH. Many feel it would be better for this administration if he did.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We agree with the gentleman; at least, I agree with the gentleman. When the gentleman goes down there, will he speak to the President about that?

Mr. SABATH. Well, confidentially—and this is off the record—I have several times told the President I thought he had made mistakes appointing so many Republicans in high positions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman ought to help him rectify them.

Mr. SABATH. I wish I could—because I remember how the Republicans that President Wilson appointed, and the industrial leaders he trusted, turned against him.

Mr. Speaker, the same tactics and the same unfair methods are being practiced and used against President Roosevelt, and his life is made almost unbearable by continuous sniping and scurrilous attacks, and especially by those whom he had appointed and later was obliged to dispense with; yes, even by those who still are holding important positions under him.

But, fortunately, due to the extraordinarily courageous and able manner in which he has conducted the affairs of this Nation, these tactics will not, I am sure, have any effect, because he knows not only how to give it, but also how to take it. The people are appreciative of his great service and the able manner in which he has been carrying on under the most adverse and annoying conditions. He is recognized, unquestionably, not only in this country but the world over, as the outstanding leader fighting for the democratic institutions and freedom and liberty and human treatment for all.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It does look to us innocent bystanders that the Army, Navy, and the War Department are the only agencies of the Government that are really doing an outstanding job in this war.

I cannot recommend the O. P. A. or the rest of them.

Mr. SABATH. I realize that you, unfortunately, the same as other Republicans, do not approve the work that has been done by the O. P. A. or by any other bureaus or departments. I wonder whether there are any other bureaus or departments outside of those you mention whose activities you do approve or give credit to for doing good work. I know that after the history has been written you will find that all those departments headed by Democrats will be shown as having performed real, efficient, and honest service, in contrast to those bureaus or departments headed by Republicans; and, notwithstanding your remarks, I will say that you and all others properly informed will come to the conclusion that both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy could have surrounded themselves with more experienced and more able men to carry on the important activities and they would not have allowed themselves to be seduced by influential Republican manipulating contractors and manufacturers and would not have permitted them to take advantage of the Government to the extent that they have.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the Secretary of the Navy had reliable and dependable men they never would have advised him to sign the contract with the Standard Oil Co. giving them the Elk Hill oil reserves, and he would not have been obliged to admit that a mistake had been made and that the contract should be canceled. I am informed that, notwithstanding the ruling of the Department of Justice that the contract was illegal, it has not been canceled as yet and that the Standard Oil Co. is there still drilling wells.

The same recklessness applies to the War Department where Republicans were appointed and relied upon to carry on, who were undeserving of the trust reposed in them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think the President should have been smart enough not to pick these fellows and that he ought to get rid of them by this time?

Mr. SABATH. He hoped to secure the cooperation of all regardless of their political affiliation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why did he not give Mr. Hoover some consideration?

Mr. SABATH. Hoover made such a miserable failure when he was President, for Heaven's sake, you would not ask the President to put him in, would you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He did not fail at feeding the world in the last war?

Mr. SABATH. This because he had guiding and binding instructions from the great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson. But when Hoover was on his own as President, surely you nor anyone else will contend that he fed the American people. Is your memory so short that you do not remember the de-

plorable conditions which existed while he was President? You also must remember when thousands of ex-service men came to Washington pleading for food and aid, instead of giving them work or bread it was his order to give them lead.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask the chairman of the Rules Committee, who is a spokesman for the New Deal and a real authority, whether he thinks Col. Frank Knox has made a good Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. SABATH. Thanks for the compliment. However, I am not a spokesman. I only defend the administration when it is maliciously accused, libeled, and deliberately smeared. As to the Secretary of the Navy, I will say that I believe a good Democrat would have surely taken and displayed a more friendly interest in the administration in general and would have done better. I have nothing personal against Mr. Knox. Personally he is an affable gentleman. But, unfortunately, as I have stated, he has failed because he has surrounded himself with Republican assistants who did not possess adequate capacity and experience.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee will agree that, even though his contentions may be correct that some Republicans in the administration were palmed off on the President, Mr. Roosevelt did select Harry Hopkins and Sam Rosenman for himself. He did not have any help on them.

Mr. SABATH. I am actually surprised that the gentleman from Ohio, whom I highly esteem, should try to place Mr. Hopkins and Judge Rosenman in the same category with the many inefficient Republicans. He knows, or should know, like others who are attempting to make a political issue of the close friendship of Mr. Hopkins and Judge Rosenman with the President, that these two gentlemen are the brainiest and most loyal Presidential aides, and have rendered the country and the President most yeoman and valuable service. I defy anyone to prove to the contrary. No one can honestly say that Mr. Hopkins and Judge Rosenman are not thoroughly patriotic and able gentlemen.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think Colonel Knox has failed to make good and that they have made good? Will the gentleman give me an answer to my question?

Mr. SABATH. I have answered a similar question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and other Republicans unfriendly to the Secretary of the Navy, and therefore there is no need to answer again, especially in view of the fact that I have taken so much of the time of the House, and I am now compelled to conclude.

However, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I will be in much better position to answer after I shall have received more complete reports on the Standard Oil and other contracts entered into by the various Navy bureaus under Secretary Knox.

I have called attention to these various matters, not with the intention of retarding the activities of the War and the Navy Departments but with the hope of stopping the reckless and extravagant expenditures and in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of any time left, and now yield 30 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the rule as far as I have heard. There is a contest on this bill as to the amount of money involved. It carries \$300,000,000 for war housing. The committee was divided as to the sum of money that should be included. I want to go on record at the outset by saying that I shall support an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] reducing the amount from \$300,000,000 to \$200,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, although I have supported all these war housing bills in the past, I take this position because when those who offered the bill appeared before the Rules Committee they were unable to give us or refused to give us the information that we asked, both the chairman, myself, and other members, as to where this money would go, the amounts, the projects, and so forth. We were told we must go into executive session, which we did, then we proceeded to ask these questions and we got no answers. We did not get this information even in executive session. We spent some 2 hours in executive session, which was wasted time.

If those who are backing the legislation, particularly those representing the housing agencies, refuse to give information that Members of Congress and members of the Rules Committee ask, then I think we could well afford to slice a certain amount off the bill. If they can make out a case in the future they could come back next year for more.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what information was requested of me that was not given that I could appropriately have given.

Mr. FISH. The information asked of the gentleman was referred by him to the head of the Housing Agency who did not give the information either to the chairman of the Rules Committee who asked him or to myself, all of this taking place in executive session, which I do not think we should go into any further. We did ask the gentleman and the gentleman referred the question to Mr. Blandford.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman I brought before the Rules Com-

mittee myself the confidential information given by the Navy Department and given by the War Department with reference to this measure. Of course, the hearings themselves show the allocations by States, and for obvious reasons it would not be wise to state the particular places where certain projects will be built because that would simply increase the expense to the Government.

Mr. FISH. The very purpose for which the Committee on Rules went into executive session, as the chairman knows—and he is sitting right next to the gentleman from Texas—was to get this information as to projects and not by States. We got no information whatever in regard to these projects. If I am wrong, I want to be corrected by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and I yield to him.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from New York is right that we did go into executive session to obtain that information, because we did not wish to embarrass the War Department. At the same time, we felt that we ought to have that information as to where these tremendous sums were going to be expended. They were to be spent not on new projects so much as on some of the old, already built plants, many of which may never be utilized.

Mr. LANHAM. In all fairness, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly; I want to be fair.

Mr. LANHAM. The information as to the localities of the specific projects would have to be given by the administrative authorities. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Administrator of the National Housing Agency was present and rose to give that very information, but then he was interrupted and his testimony concluded in order that the gentleman from Indiana might be heard.

Mr. FISH. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that at all, because I asked that specific question at least three times, and so did the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and we got no answer. He had ample time to answer but he declined to furnish the information.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I have just now been handed a report from the War Department, which is marked "Confidential." It is a little late. I did not wish to delay calling up the rule until that had reached me. However, it is forthcoming now, and the gentleman can glance at it when the time comes.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in certain sections of the country men engaged in war production work are living with their families in shacks, tents, and camp wagons, amid filth and squalor?

Mr. FISH. I am certainly aware of that. That is why I am supporting the bill to the extent of two-thirds of the amount, or \$200,000,000, so that they can take care of these very conditions to which the gentleman refers. They should be given preferred treatment.

Mr. WELCH. You cannot take care of these conditions by cutting down the amount asked for.

Mr. FISH. Yes; because a lot of this money does not go to relieve the conditions to which the gentleman refers. I am as interested as is the gentleman in taking care of the sore spots immediately, and it will be taken care of by the first \$200,000,000. Let them come back and ask for more if they can show the need for it.

Mr. WELCH. May I further state to the gentlemen that it has been found that as many as eight men engaged in defense work were living in one small room, sleeping in what are called hot beds, some going out and others coming in?

Mr. FISH. I realize that such conditions do exist. We are trying to remedy them, and they should be given preferred treatment.

Mr. WELCH. Why cut the appropriation provided for in the bill?

Mr. FISH. Why have appropriations for other places when we do not need them? We will take care of the conditions to which the gentleman refers, where 8 or 10 or 12 men are sleeping in 1 room. What I am insisting on is that it is about time we began to discuss the Army appropriations. There has been a lot of waste, recklessness, and a lot of expenditures which have not been warranted from the beginning. Up to now it has been almost a sacred matter; we must not discuss the Army recommendations or appropriations. They have been sacrosanct. But thank God the time has come now when we can discuss them and bring them out in the open the way the Senate did yesterday, and denounce the waste and the squandering of the taxpayers' money. I propose to do it about these very recommendations and to show what the Army is doing with a new TNT plant in the State of New York.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I merely want the RECORD to show that there has been a discussion of Army appropriations. While we recognize that in the haste of the war effort we cannot control everything, the Army appropriation bill that was reported this time did make a cut of \$387,000,000 below the Budget request.

Mr. FISH. Is it the \$71,000,000,000 bill to which the gentleman is referring?

Mr. CASE. Yes. It was the first time since Pearl Harbor that Budget estimates on War Department requests have been cut.

Mr. FISH. That is what I am referring to, and thank goodness we are beginning to scrutinize them.

I have here an article from the New York Times of June 23 which reads as follows:

#### TNT WORKS TO STOP PRODUCTION JULY 31

Seven thousand five hundred-acre plant in Niagara County, N. Y., to be closed for lack of need of product.

Company operating United States-owned concern aids replacement of 7,500 war workers.

This dispatch comes from a town called Modeltown, N. Y., and is dated June 22.

The huge Lake Ontario Ordnance Works, in operation 9 months, will stop production of TNT July 31 because, its commanding officer said today, of the lack of need for its product.

The sprawling plant, covering about 7,500 fruit-rich acres in Niagara County, is Government-owned and operated.

Then it goes on to say that the plant has its own water supply system, adequate to meet the needs of a city of 100,000. It has a power plant, railroad, transportation system, telephone and electrical distribution system, fire department, well-equipped hospitals, and so forth. Here is a huge expenditure by the War Department. The plant has only been set up and operated for about 9 months, and it is going to quit on the 31st day of next month, after expenditures of millions and millions of dollars. Has not the Congress the right to ask questions about legislation, to scrutinize it before passing upon war appropriations? Where are these housing projects to be erected? How is the money going to be spent?

I remember protesting about the hotels taken over by the Army and asking for information. They took over 400 hotels, and within the last week they released 206 of these hotels, yet we are told we must not criticize recommendations made by the War Department.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Of course, we should make these examinations. I am sure the gentleman would not want to indicate that this particular TNT plant should keep on operating after there was no need for its operation?

Mr. FISH. I am just exposing what has been done. The Army chose the plant and set it up. The Army took 7,500 acres of fruit trees, the best land they could find, and set up this plant, and now they are going to abandon it after they have wasted all these millions of dollars. This is only one instance. I believe the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson] will show four or five others. I am simply stating that it is about time we criticized some of these wartime expenditures. I am opposed to this \$300,000,000 because they did not make out a case. They did not give us the information we are entitled to. I will vote to cut \$100,000,000 from the bill and if they need more, let them come in and make their case.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Right along that line which the gentleman is discussing, I have here a newspaper article quoting the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, saying that industry has failed

by 5½ percent to meet the production needs of the Army ground forces. That was in May. He said this failure of May production is the most critical single occurrence in the Army supply program. Now, does not the gentleman feel that perhaps this instance to which he has referred is one particular item when General Patterson says the Army needs have fallen off 5½ percent?

Mr. FISH. Well, it may be the fault of the Army. Evidently they did fail. Maybe it was Mr. Patterson himself who failed, and is using that as an alibi to place the blame on private industry. It looks to me as if he has absolutely failed in locating and building this now useless TNT plant. It must be obvious that the time has come for Members of Congress to investigate these war expenditures and stop the waste and extravagance and often reckless recommendations of the War Department.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. In my district they have cut one of these large plants 50 percent. I understand it is because of a shortage of steel to make those products. Can you blame the War Department for the shortage of steel?

Mr. FISH. You can blame them for setting up a plant and not knowing in advance what they were going to need. They have priorities on everything. The gentleman should not try to alibi the War Department. They have a priority on all the steel and copper and everything they need.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I do not see how I can yield further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, while I am discussing this subject I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, one of the most distinguished and lovable Members of the House, if he has any particular information about the deferment of Mr. Leon Keyserling, who is in his thirties, around 34 years of age, counsel general for the National Housing Agency, married, without children; yet he has been given a deferment. He is one of the 89,000. There are 89,000 too many deferments given to these Federal appointees and officeholders, who are hiding away in governmental fox holes on the governmental pay roll. I am opposed particularly to these young men like Keyserling, holding well-paid jobs, who should set an example for the rest of the Federal employees, when sons of parents in your district and in mine, sometimes two or three in a family, are called into the service. Why should this young man 34 years of age be declared essential to carry on the National Housing Agency? Perhaps the gentleman can elucidate and inform the House on the necessity for this deferment.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that I do not think that is any more pertinent to the subject of whether or not these workers in some sections need some living quarters than many of the other things that have crept into

this debate, which have not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and which have nothing in the world to do with the question at issue.

Mr. FISH. I am sure the gentleman had nothing to do with holding Mr. Keyserling in office, but I thought he might furnish some information about it, because a lot of these bright young men are being declared as essential, and I believe the higher up they are the more they should feel it was their duty to take the lead in serving their country in the armed forces, and not in the well-paid and safe Government dugouts in Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that inasmuch as the Rules Committee seems to be making of itself a legislative committee and since he says that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has not given proper consideration to this matter, when there are almost 300 pages of hearings in addition to several days of confidential hearings, it might be up to the gentleman's committee to look into these deferment matters. They do not pertain to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FISH. The Rules Committee never made any such statement, nor criticized the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We asked for information which they refused to give us. We are nothing but the servants of the House. We tried to get this information and Mr. Blanchard refused to give it to the chairman and myself. We were not trying to legislate. We were not trying to amend the bill. We have no right to amend the bill except on the floor of the House. We have a duty and right to get information, which was denied us. It is the first time that it has been denied to the Rules Committee since I have been a Member, by any bureaucrat or agency of the Government. The information was not presented even after we went into executive session.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### ADMINISTRATION POLICIES DESTROY LOW-COST FOOD

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been told continually that the price controls now being administered by the Government are for the benefit of the consumer, particularly the consumer in the large cities of this country. Let me take just one example to prove the absurdity of this contention.

#### PANCAKE FLOUR

The average housewife throughout the length and breadth of this Nation utilizes the equivalent of at least ten 20-ounce packages of pancake flour a year. All she has to do is to mix this flour with

milk or water or both and make her pancakes. Everything, including sugar, soda, and salt, is already in the mix. Pancake flour is not rationed and pancakes represent a substantial portion of the diet in many millions of families, particularly those of hard manual laborers such as coal miners and lumberjacks.

There were two kinds of pancake flour generally sold throughout the United States. The nationally advertised standard brands were sold in 20-ounce packages at retail somewhere between 12 and 15 cents per package. There were, in addition, the pancake flours on which the buyer's brand was placed, which were unadvertised and which were sold almost exclusively through the chain-store systems all over the country. The retail price of this type ran from 5 to 7 cents per 20-ounce package. Of the total consumed, about 40 percent came from the advertised brands and 60 percent from the other brands. For the sake of this illustration I am not trying to distinguish as between the ordinary pancake flours, the buckwheat flours, or the soybean flours, because the illustration which I give applies equally to all three, even though some price adjustments would have to be made for each.

Ceilings were placed on pancake flours. These ceilings were supposed to represent prices as of March 1942, but because of contracts made a year earlier, most of these prices were based on May or September 1941 costs. Since ceilings were placed on pancake flour, the cost to the manufacturer of every ingredient has gone up. This applies to the manufacturers of the standard brands as well as to the manufacturers of the unadvertised brands. Using 6 cents as the average price at which a 20-ounce package of unadvertised pancake flour was sold at retail, the cost of the ingredients had increased by slightly over 1 cent, to say nothing of increased labor costs. The industry asked for a 1-cent increase, indicating that it would be willing to absorb the additional labor costs and the slight excess in cost of ingredients. The O. P. A. officials were apparently sympathetic, but have been themselves, because of orders from the higher-ups, unable to grant the increase. What was the result? Eighty percent of all the manufacturers of unadvertised brands have gone out of business. Fifty percent of the volume of pancake flour which used to be distributed is no longer being distributed. Housewives wishing to buy pancake flour today must pay 12 cents to 15 cents for the advertised brands, and can only buy in limited quantities. While the manufacturers of the advertised brands are continuing to supply their customers with limited quantities, even these manufacturers are seriously squeezed because of the ingredient cost increases which have taken place since November 1941. To make the matter even worse, and this is the most shameful aspect of the situation, two new companies have come into the market manufacturing this type of pancake flour, and because of the fact that they had no previous history nor previous ceilings to meet, are allowed to price

their product at the maximum price being charged for any similar product as of the time they began business. These new companies are charging 19 cents to 24 cents per 20-ounce package, and some housewives are forced to pay this price if they want pancake flour. One of these two companies bought up the machinery of a company which had been forced out of business by the Administration, and presumably the same will happen in time for all the companies which are being forced out.

Can any more absurd situation be found? If the 1-cent increase in price had been allowed on the 6-cent package, housewives would still be able to buy at 7 cents a highly nutritious, unrationed food. Because of the failure to grant this increase, they are required to pay 100 percent to 300 percent more for a greatly curtailed quantity of the same product.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has rendered a great service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress so well. What he says is very true. There are two large mills and perhaps more, in my own district, which are closed now because they could not get a slight raise. These new companies are selling their product for more, and it is a product of inferior quality.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that these companies who have heretofore been selling pancake flour at 6 cents a package had to go out of business and that the Administration is permitting other companies or other concerns to go into business and sell the same product at 24 cents a package?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any information that he can place in the RECORD along with the extension of his remarks, which would give us enlightenment on how come there is a spread of from 6 to 7 cents in the price between advertised and unadvertised brands?

Mr. HERTER. I can answer the gentleman's question.

The spread is accounted for by the fact that the advertised brands pay for advertising, for greater distribution costs, and usually for better packaging.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman 1½ additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HERTER**. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. **HOFFMAN**. Will the gentleman also be good enough to place in the **RECORD** the names of the individuals who financed or who have stock interests in these new companies which took over this manufacturing business?

Mr. **HERTER**. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. **JENKINS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HERTER**. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. **JENKINS**. In further reference to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, is this not the fact that the difference between this price is purely due to the advertised product and the superior package, but the quality and quantity is exactly the same?

Mr. **HERTER**. Almost identically the same.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. **FISH**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. **JONKMAN**].

#### FEDERAL UNION?

Mr. **JONKMAN**. Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution clarifies the way for Congress in its responsibility as the direct representative of the people for a very important duty—that is, to separate such proposed machineries as are feasible to accomplish a just and lasting peace consistent with the general welfare of the American people, from those numerous plans which would prove thoroughly unworkable and create greater difficulties and catastrophes than those we are seeking to avoid.

One of the latter which is receiving considerable attention is the proposal of Mr. Clarence K. Streit, known as Federal Union. This proposal is to form a union of such nations of the world as have most nearly common objectives and standards, or as it is put by him under his latest plan, such nations as have compelling ties.

Under this plan such nations as are to form the Federal Union will cede certain of their powers just as the States of the United States have ceded certain powers to the Federal Government. Under this plan, Mr. Streit proposes a union government and citizenship, a union defense force, a union customs-free economy, a union money, and a union postal and communications system. Of course, this Federal Union would have to have some power of taxation and power to borrow money on the faith and credit of the combined nations.

In other words, Mr. Streit proposes a world government in which the nations thereof would stand in the same relation to it as the States in our Union stand with relation to the Federal Government, with practically the same relative powers and responsibilities. It would also mean that once we were in that world government we would have no right of secession any more than the States had in our Civil War.

It is the contention of the supporters of Federal Union that it is patterned

after the United States, and that because the United States has prevented war between the States, this proposed Federal Union, being analogous, would prevent further wars between the nations, and establish a just and lasting peace. One of the first difficulties of the supporters of Federal Union is that there is practically no analogy between the United States and the proposed Federal Union.

In the first place the primary purpose of the union of the Thirteen Colonies was not to prevent war between those States, as is the purpose of the Federal Union.

The preamble of the Constitution of the United States reads:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

If there was any such intention to prevent war between the Thirteen States in the minds of the constitutional founders, it was only incidental, and it would require considerable imagination to find reference thereto unless it is in the clause "to insure domestic tranquillity," which, inasmuch as it follows the clause "to establish justice," undoubtedly referred to the tranquillity of communities rather than with reference of State to State.

In the second place there is no analogy in that these Thirteen States of the Union first fought the war and after the war had been won, they then began negotiations for the forming of a union of the Thirteen States. Federal Union proposes to accomplish the union of world governments while we are fighting this war. This in the nature of a shotgun wedding, or a wedding by a justice of the peace, to be later confirmed by a minister. For Mr. Streit contends that this union can be effected by the President and the Congress without consulting and against the will of the people. This formality of submitting the plan to the people, he says, can be observed later after the provisional union has been effected. Our Constitution of the United States was adopted with careful deliberation and after the Revolutionary War had been fought to a successful conclusion. It is doubtful if the Thirteen States of the Union could have accomplished both of these great objectives of winning the war and establishing a Federal Government at one and the same time. This is equally true of forming a Federal Union while we are fighting this war.

In the third place, there is no analogy because the Thirteen States were contiguous and all situated in one small area and had been living in one house, so to speak, for 150 years. Such unions of adjacent, contiguous, independent states have not been unusual. They have been formed not only as republics, like the United States of America and the Swiss Federation, but also, to take the worst examples, in such autocracies, as Germany and Italy. Federal Union, on the other hand, is proposing such a federation of nations scattered all over the world, and there is no precedent of suc-

cess under those conditions. The only example we have is the British Empire, and there the proof is against the success of a union of such scattered, independent units, for I think it will be generally conceded that of the two, this British Empire is disintegrating rather than integrating and solidifying.

In the fourth place, there is no analogy because the formation of our Federal Government out of independent States was a process of slow evolution and growth, extending over a period of nearly 300 years. The first Thirteen States had undergone a growth and interdependence of nearly 150 years before they formed the Union, and that evolutionary process resulting in the present 48 States took nearly another 150 years. In the proposed federal union of nations, on the other hand, the proponents thereof seek to accomplish this at one fell swoop and practically overnight by revolutionary processes. The fact that the first was accomplished by an evolutionary process, through a period of 300 years is no indication that it can be done practically overnight.

In the fifth place, there is no analogy because the Thirteen Original States, as well as those subsequently added, were bound together by a common language, while in Federal Union it is proposed to unite peoples of various and different languages.

In the sixth place, Federal Union is not analogous to the United States because the proposed nations for the former are rife with all the dynamics of war, while in the latter these were practically nonexistent. In the United States there were no differences in ideologies except on the slavery question which, while it was recognized at the time of the framing of the Constitution, was not solved. And this as we know provoked the bloodiest and most destructive civil war in the history of the world.

There was no excessive nationalism. In fact the States had enjoyed independence for so brief a time that it can hardly be said that a spirit of nationalism had been generated in the independent States.

There was no economic pressure to speak of. Such bickering as there was between the States over tariffs was negative and never approached what we today understand as the economic pressure in nations.

There was, of course, no imperialism or spirit of imperialism.

As we know, not one of the States was burdened with militarism.

Even those war-breeding elements of fear, hate, and revenge were so negligible as to make the union feasible. In the proposed Federal Union, or Federation of Nations, on the other hand, all of these dynamics of war have existed for centuries; they have not been eradicated and perhaps will find just as violent expression after this war as they ever have.

The Thirteen Colonies had in the main common objectives and common standards. The United States, with the exception of those leading up to the Civil War at least, was free from the ideolo-

gies, excessive nationalism, economic pressures, imperialism, militarism, fear, hate, and revenge, one or more of which characterize practically all of the nations with whom it is proposed to form a federal union.

Proponents of Federal Union and similar ideologies have been obliged to change their plans several times because of the various insurmountable objections and barriers found in every plan advanced up to the present time. Recently in a discussion in the American Forum of the Air, Mr. Streit stated that his first plan was a federation of democracies; that he had abandoned that plan for a British-American union. When pressed he admitted that he had also abandoned that plan; that the present and last Federal Union plan contemplated a Federal Union of the United States with those nations with which we have "compelling ties." These he enumerated, although not as an exhaustive list, as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, the United Kingdom, the Union of South Africa, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and France.

However, before the discussion ended he had evolved a new plan. When asked why he did not include Russia or China, or both, this apparently presented a hurdle which he could not overcome with Federal Union. I understand Federal Union, Inc., has about 75 chapters all over the United States. About half of them favor including Russia, while the other half is against it. They also differ widely on including China. So in the forum discussion, to meet that obstacle, Mr. Streit proposed the forming of two organizations: First, Federal Union, comprising an integrated government as above stated, and in addition to that the United Nations, which would be open to membership for all the nations of the earth who wished to join.

In other words, that is to say, Federal Union, consisting of the enlightened, progressive, and desirable, the chosen, elect, and superior nations of the earth, would constitute one nation. Then as such a unit they would invite all the other nations rejected as unfit, too backward, and perhaps too dangerous for Federal Union to join them as the United Nations for what—just imagine—to attain a just and lasting peace between the nations of the world.

One is reminded of what I believe it was Clemenceau is alleged to have said when he was apprised of the Wilson peace plan at Versailles. He retorted, "That means we will eventually have to give up our colonies." And when another imperialistic representative said, "Oh, no; I don't think we'll have to go that far," he snorted, "Then, by God, you don't want peace, you want war."

It is obvious to the most superficial that the obstacles presenting themselves from every angle spring from the fact that there is no analogy between the United States and the Federal Union except the attempt to organize various independent units into one organism. Right there the analogy ceases. For instance, I believe that, according to Mr. Streit's figures, the population of the above-named countries acceptable for

Federal Union would be about 200,000,000 people. Just what would Federal Union do if the British Empire accorded India, with its 350,000,000 people, Dominion status? How could this be prevented in a democratic nation? And yet, if Great Britain should do this, would not the Indians by right of representation dominate and control the entire Federal Union? In other words, the people of the United States would be governed by the Indians. Nevertheless this is something we would have to face.

As I said earlier, Mr. Streit changes his plans involving the destiny of all the people on the earth, and especially the 130,000,000 Americans very rapidly. I think it may safely be said that at the present time his leading lieutenant is Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the United States Supreme Court. Now, in the short space of 45 minutes in the American Forum of the Air Mr. Streit changed his plans so quickly that his lieutenant, the Justice, could not keep up with him.

While Mr. Streit stated that Russia and China could not be admitted to the inner circle of Federal Union, but would have to be satisfied with membership in the United Nations, Justice Roberts still wanted to operate under the old plan, for in that same forum discussion the Justice said:

One objection that I hear often is that it must be all or none, and that we cannot hope that all nations will join in any such union. On the contrary, I think it clear that those nations who are willing to join should be invited to join now, and that such as do join should federate to make their united power felt throughout the world.

Clearly, Mr. Streit left his lieutenant, the Justice, out on a limb. His precarious position is obvious. Mr. Streit's proposed union government would consist of a congress composed of a senate and house, and a 5-man executive board instead of a president. Each nation will be entitled to 1 representative for each million inhabitants, and 2 senators with one additional senator for each 25,000,000 population. Two members of the board would be elected by the congress, and the other 3 by direct popular vote of the people of member nations.

It requires practically no arithmetic to state that under such representative government Russia, China, and India, with their combined 1,000,000,000 of population, would not only control the congress but the executive board; and the people of not only the United States, but the rest of the world would be governed by the Slavic and oriental nations. Mr. Streit, as before stated, hesitates to go so far, but the Justice in effect says "yes" without batting an eyelash. He is driven to this because no formula of representative government could be devised which would avoid this result. Justice Roberts, on the other hand, seemed to sharply disagree with Mr. Streit's contention that the United States could join a federal union through action by the President and the Congress. Asked whether such a step would have to be submitted to the people under article V of the Federal Constitution, the answer of Justice Roberts in the forum was, "I said I thought

it should be done." It requires but little imagination to foresee what devastating effect the submission of such a question to the people of the 48 States would have on our unity in winning the war.

Justice Roberts is just as vague as is Mr. Streit in many concepts of Federal Union. To get away from the forum discussion, I would like to discuss for a moment a speech alleged to have been made by Mr. Justice Roberts on May 1 last, before the American Society of International Law. Justice Roberts did not seem to be overanxious to discuss that speech in the forum. In it he said:

It is said that nations are not ready to be tied together in a complicated governmental organization, wholly new and untried. I answer that the important matter is not how much, but how little authority should in the first instance, be delegated to any such government. It would seem that a very simple bill of rights—a power to raise and support armies, a commerce power analogous to that exercised in the United States by Congress, a power to create an international medium of exchange, and a power to create a federal postal system, would be essential, and that little, if anything more, should initially be attempted: perhaps not that much.

It might be asked: Does Justice Roberts propose to build this stupendous world government on a contradiction, on a paradox by saying, the weaker we can build this organism the stronger it will be?

And when he says "perhaps not so much," which authorities or powers is he doubtful about? Which would he eliminate?

Or does he mean that it must be made to look attractive and harmless, like a trap, because after the trap has been sprung he can do with the victim as he chooses?

Under Mr. Streit's proposal of a union government and union citizenship, it is true, of course, that all immigration laws would be repealed, and citizens of any nation would have free access, requiring not even a health examination to pass from the territory of one nation to another, just as in the United States we can pass from one State to another freely. They have no answer to the question as how to prevent millions upon millions from the lower brackets in foreign countries from an influx into this country to enjoy a more abundant life and the "four freedoms" in preference to the hardships of rehabilitating their own countries in Europe. Nor can they answer how the employment, commercial and farm economy of our country could stand the burden of such an influx.

When, in the Forum of the Air this question was asked of Mr. Streit, Justice Roberts sprang to the rescue with the following answer:

Congressman, I think that is not a question to be decided in the fundamental concept of union at all. That is a matter that can be settled and left for settlement later. It is a matter that can be left to each government at this time.

Well, I think that the American people will want that and a host of similar questions answered beforehand, not after the trap has been sprung.

Take for instance the matter of "a customs-free economy" free trade between

the nations of the earth just as now exists between the States of our Union. To establish this by revolution, overnight, would flood our markets with industrial and agricultural products from the cheap labor of sister nations. Regardless of how desirous we may be of gradually eliminating trade barriers as the standard of living of other nations approaches our own, to permit flooding of our markets as proposed would engulf and smother our own standard of living in a moment.

Other equally dire and disastrous consequences would flow from such measures as transferring the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, the power to lay and collect taxes, the power to borrow money on the faith and credit of the United States, the power to declare war, and so forth, all of which the people have entrusted to Congress exclusively under constitutional safeguards, to another and foreign sovereign power.

We have only to examine the Keynes-Morgenthau proposed international exchange or bank plan to know who would furnish the gold or whatever medium of exchange the system would use as a base for Federal Union money. Under the Keynes-Morgenthau bank plan the United States, as a creditor nation, would furnish the cash while the other nations could put in I. O. U.'s, and the borrowers, having 75 votes to our 25, could not only compel us to loan, but use these loans for "boondoggling" or any purpose they see fit, and compel us to continue and increase the loans until we were broke. How do we know that a federal-union monetary system would be any better?

Of course, the proponents of federal union have not immediately included the power to tax and the power to borrow money. It would be difficult, however, to explain how a federal union of world states could be operated on a shoestring any more than the United States can do so even in peacetimes.

In short, such a proposal as federal union would not only present such dissension, discord, and strife as would seriously divide, hamstring, and frustrate our united efforts to win the war, but it would saddle on a new and untried political organism a program so stupendous that it is bound to bog down and is foredoomed to failure; and not only that, but if the American Nation should become a member of federal union, she would be putting herself in the position of a woman who marries a man because she cannot reform him in any other way. But after the marriage she would find herself in a predicament more critical and calamitous than ever, and one from which she could not extricate herself except with isolation and humiliation.

Congress, after a decade of abdication, is again resuming its rightful function as the organism through which the people of the United States speak and govern their domestic as well as their foreign affairs. I believe that the Fulbright resolution will enjoy the universal approval of the American people. It is a step and medium by which the people can express themselves through the Con-

gress on a safe and sane foreign policy for the attainment of a just and lasting peace between the nations of the earth, if such a thing is humanly possible.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York called attention to the closing of some explosive plants. I think the record should show that the subcommittee on War Department appropriations went into that question in their recent hearings.

The reason certain explosive plants are being closed are three: First, because the speed of production has exceeded original estimates; second, because the developments of the war have decreased the need for certain types of explosives—we had more in north Africa than we had to use, but thank God we had more rather than running short—and third, because a new, more powerful explosive is being developed and so we are turning to that and reducing the production of the old type. At this point I wish to read a few of the sentences which were left in the printed hearings out of the extended discussion we had on this subject. I quote:

Colonel HOFSTETTER. The principal items in there are for the expansion of explosive plants which we need because a new explosive has been developed, which is more powerful than anything we have had in the past. \* \* \* We have been under considerable pressure from the Air Corps to bring about increased production of this product. That explosive is considered much more powerful than TNT, and they find that if they can use this powerful explosive they can accomplish the same results by using a smaller number of planes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from Texas that he has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Alabama to call up a conference report.

#### CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Allen, Ill.	Green	Morrison, Ia.
Baldwin, Md.	Hall	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Nichols
Barden	Hall	O'Hara
Bell	Leonard W.	O'Leary
Boren	Hébert	O'Toole
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Phillips
Buckley	Izac	Plumley
Byrne	Jennings	Rivers
Capozzoli	Johnson	Russell
Cochran	Luther A.	Sasser
Culkin	Johnson	Scanlon
Dawson	Ward	Sheppard
Dingell	Kilburn	Sheridan
Eaton	King	Somers, N. Y.
Fay	LeFevre	Tolan
Fernandez	Lesinski	Towe
Fitzpatrick	Luce	Treadway
Ford	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Furlong	Merritt	Vorys, Ohio
Gallagher	Monroney	Wheat

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings, under the rule, were dispensed with.

#### CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term '31st of March' where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term '30th of June,' and by deleting from the second sentence thereof 'on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the basis of the cost, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower.' Only one appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made

during the calendar year 1943 which shall be on the basis established by this amendment.

"Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term '\$2,650,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the term '\$3,400,000,000'.

"Sec. 3. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a) and by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term 'June 30, 1943' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945'; and is further hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'without regard to provisions of any other existing law relating to public funds: *Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedure to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1943, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year and shall not be made until the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have had a reasonable opportunity, not to exceed ninety days, to examine the report, point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1945, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places

where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.

"Sec. 4. The Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"Sec. 5. Subsection 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 375a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'This subsection shall not apply to loans which the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to take over or purchase.'

"Sec. 6. (a) No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, a price below the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942.

"(b) No subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to August 1, 1943, shall be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any commodity referred to in subsection (a) either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices so established, maintained or announced as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, maintained or announced, or (3) to maintain any maximum price already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943, or to Government-owned wheat sold for feeding purposes if sold at not less than the parity price of corn, or to prevent such adjustments in the maximum or support prices on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use.

"(d) The definition of the term 'person' in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall apply to the term 'person' as used in this section.

"Sec. 7. The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further,* That the au-

thority conferred by this section with respect to the buying, selling, storage and use of commodities, and the authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture by section 4 of the Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498) as amended, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only with the approval of the War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322, as amended, and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, and for carrying out the purposes of the Act of March 11, 1941. Such authority to buy commodities used for food purposes shall include the power to buy them for the purpose of selling at a loss, but any such purchase for sale at a loss (1) shall be made only from the farmer at a price not less than the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, and not less than the support price therefor as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, or (2) shall be made in the open market at a price which will reflect such price (referred to in clause (1)) to the farmer; and no such purchase for sale at a loss shall be made for the purpose of reducing or rolling back any maximum price established under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided further,* That the War Food Administrator shall not approve purchases for the purpose of selling at a loss, except those required to carry out any program (other than a roll back program) announced prior to July 1, 1943; and such approvals shall not involve losses in a total amount in excess of \$150,000,000. The government agency or corporation making such purchases shall dispose of the commodities purchased as soon as feasible through the regular recognized channels and functions of trade and distribution used in free and independent enterprise; but no such commodity shall be sold or disposed of by any governmental agency or corporation (1) at a price below the price limitations imposed by sections 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this Act or section 3 of Public Law 729 approved October 2, 1942, or (2) contrary to the provisions of the last sentence of this subsection or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this Act. No governmental agency or corporation shall buy any such commodity for the purpose of selling it at a loss except pursuant to the authority contained in this section.'

"Sec. 8. Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,  
BRENT SPENCE,  
PAUL BROWN,  
WRIGHT PATMAN,  
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,  
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,  
F. L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the part of the House,

JOHN H. BANKHEAD,  
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,  
ROBERT A. TAFT,  
HUGH A. BUTLER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of

the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the matter recommended by the committee of conference is the same as the first section of the Senate amendment. It was the same in substance as the provision of the House bill.

Section 2 would increase the amount of obligations which the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to have outstanding at any one time by \$750,000,000. The bill as it passed the House would have authorized an increase of \$500,000,000 and the Senate amendment would have authorized an increase of \$1,000,000,000.

Section 3 is the same as section 3 of the Senate amendment. It contains the provisions of section 3 of the bill as it passed the House and in addition requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to maintain complete and accurate books of account and provides for the audit of its financial transactions by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions.

Sections 4 and 5 are the same as sections 4 and 5 of the bill as it passed the House.

Section 6, except for rearrangement and clarification of language, corresponds to section 6 of the bill as it passed the House and to the Alken amendment which was included as section 5 of the Senate amendment.

Section 7 is a modification of the O'Mahoney amendment which was included as section 6 of the Senate amendment and applies only to commodities used for food purposes. It validates programs of buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities under section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and programs for support prices under section 4 of the Act of July 1, 1941, if the program was announced prior to July 1, 1943, but does not validate any roll-back program. Section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is amended to provide that the War Food Administrator must approve such programs (other than roll-back programs) and places a limitation on losses of \$150,000,000.

Section 8 is the same as section 8 of the bill as it passed the House.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,  
BRENT SPENCE,  
PAUL BROWN,  
WRIGHT PATMAN,  
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,  
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,  
F. L. CRAWFORD,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield half of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. Members are familiar with the measure as it passed the House so I shall only undertake to deal with the provisions of the bill as they have been changed by the conference committee. A new provision in the conference report would establish a system of accounting to be conducted by the General Accounting Office. It is a rather long provision, but there was no objection on the part of any of the conferees either from the House or Senate, and it was worked out in conjunction with officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation and is acceptable to them. I assume there will be no

objection to that part of the bill, although it was not in the House bill.

The material changes in the bill, or at least two provisions of the bill in which the Members are mainly interested, are the so-called subsidy provision of the bill, and the provision incorporated by the conferees which amends the buying and selling provisions of section 2 of the original Price Control Act. The subsidy provisions of the Senate bill and the House bill were in substantial agreement. The conferees adopted portions of the language from both bills, not for substantial reasons, but for clarity and for better expression and without substantial change. It is provided that no maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, a price below the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942.

A provision embodied in the conference report would prevent subsidy and other payments except those that have accrued prior to August 1, 1943, either for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices or support prices so established, maintained, or announced as may have been or may hereafter be ordered. This means that no maximum or support price can be reduced or rolled back and the difference made up as a subsidy or other payment, nor can such payment be made in lieu of increasing maximum prices or support prices already or hereafter established, maintained, or announced. This means that when an increase in maximum prices is to be put into effect it must be done directly and not on a resort to subsidies, nor can a subsidy be used to cover any portion of any maximum price already or hereafter established from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated.

This language is in effect the same as the language employed in the House bill.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to say that this prevented roll-backs that were not in effect up until August 1, 1943. Why did you pick August 1?

Mr. STEAGALL. It permits the fulfillment of obligations that accrue down to August 1.

The purpose is to validate contractual relationships, regardless of the technical situation, and insure carrying out in good faith any obligations that have been entered into in good faith. I think we should give the same consideration to any moral obligation that would be expected in case of legal obligations.

Mr. POAGE. I am perfectly willing that you shall carry out the contracts,

but do we understand that they can make new commitments between now and August 1 that will be binding?

Mr. STEAGALL. It applies only to those that accrue.

Mr. POAGE. It applies only to those that are now in existence, where the obligation has already been created and must be fulfilled between now and August 1?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is undertaking to validate any obligations or commitments that accrue down to that time.

Mr. POAGE. That is not today, that is a month from tomorrow. Does that mean that during the next month commitments can be made and they will be fulfilled?

Mr. STEAGALL. The limit June 15, 1943, applies to commitments.

Mr. POAGE. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, under the conference report roll-backs are barred.

Mr. STEAGALL. As I have indicated and will further indicate as I proceed, that is true, but not entirely.

Mr. McCORMACK. For all practical purposes does not the conference report bring about the elimination of roll-backs and subsidies except to the extent of \$150,000,000?

Mr. STEAGALL. No, the gentleman is in error. The \$150,000,000 mentioned in the bill has reference to an entirely different matter, the purchase and sale of commodities. This provision does not apply to subsidy payments which have accrued prior to the 1st day of August. It does not apply to subsidy or other payments until the end of the current crop season, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, if the Government was committed to the payment of the subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943. It does not apply to Government-owned wheat sold for feed, if sold at the parity price of corn. It does not prevent adjustments in the maximum and support prices of competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed required to bring about and maintain the necessary relationship in the price of such products necessary to secure necessary production for the war effort.

There is one further provision in the Senate bill that was incorporated in the conference report and not in the House bill to which I should like to call attention. If you will refer to subparagraph (c) under section 6 on page 3 of the conference report you will find this language:

Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Referring specifically to the so-called roll-back on butter and meat products, does this authorize the payment of any subsidy on either meat or butter after August 1?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is terminated as I have indicated.

Mr. HOPE. Does it permit obligating the Federal Government for any payments in the way of subsidies on meat and butter after June 15?

Mr. STEAGALL. August 1 is the time in which that authority would expire.

Mr. HOPE. What I want to get at is, between today and the 1st of August can any agency of the Federal Government obligate itself to pay subsidies on meat or butter?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is not the intent, unless it accrues prior to August 1.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Is it not a fact that under this conference report roll-backs and subsidies for processed meat and for everything else the people in the cities require for food are eliminated?

Mr. STEAGALL. As far as roll-backs and subsidies are concerned, that is true, within the limits of the provisions I have indicated.

Mr. LYNCH. So that no provision at all is made for the great mass of people living in the cities so that they might have a reduced cost of living through this Commodity Credit Corporation bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. I think the gentleman understands my answer to that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I call the gentleman's attention to subparagraph (c) which he has just read. Does that mean that when any concern such as a processor sells commodities to the Government there may be an adjustment of price in order to comply with the formula laid down in section 3 of the act of 1942?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know that I quite catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the Government buys, say for the Army or the Navy or Lend-Lease, meat, for instance.

Mr. STEAGALL. Purchases for Government agencies for governmental use are excepted from this provision.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would then permit claims to be filed with the O. P. A. or the proper agency for some commodity that had been sold at a loss?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know just what situation you have in mind.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Perhaps it is my fault, but it strikes me that there is confusion and a contradiction within section 6 be-

tween the various subsections of that section. In subsection (a) we have the broad language that no maximum price—and "maximum price," I take it, means ceiling price—shall be established for any agricultural commodity or anything processed therefrom below the support price to the producer. To my mind, that is a flat prohibition of all subsidies and all roll-backs. Then we get to subsection (b), where the policy against subsidies and roll-backs is announced, but with certain qualifications, with a permission to take care of the present Government commitments.

As I say, perhaps it is my lack of understanding, but I think when you read them together the two subsections do not mean anything. I wish the chairman would be kind enough to explain that to me and possibly to some other Members of the House who might experience a similar difficulty.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think there is any contradiction there. It simply says they cannot fix maximum prices below support prices.

Mr. WRIGHT. When you say you cannot fix a maximum price, that means that you cannot sell to the ultimate consumer at a price less than the price you pay the producer. In other words, that is a direct prohibition against subsidies or roll-backs and it is an all-inclusive provision. There are no qualifications, although there is an attempt to qualify in the later subsection.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think there is any question about the interpretation to be put on the language. The gentleman has indicated what the purpose of the legislation is. That is what we intend to do, within the limits of the exceptions.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Do I understand that the compromise involved in this conference report would sanction the Commodity Credit Corporation making incentive payments or subsidies already under way to increase production of articles like tomatoes, corn, beans, hemp, sugar, vegetable oils, and fats; that there is appropriated therefor \$150,000,000. Am I correct in that assertion?

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is talking now about a provision in the conference report which was not dealt with by the House bill, as I indicated at the outset of my remarks. It will be remembered that in the original price-control bill there was a provision permitting subsidies and the purchase and sale of commodities where the administrator finds that maximum production of necessary products was not being had. The purpose of that is to secure and maintain adequate production for the war effort. That was in the original price-control bill. It should be said in this connection that that authority was limited to the purpose of obtaining necessary war production and, not to undertake to enter into discussions that are controversial, the fact is that nobody

connected with the passage of that bill dreamed that it understood its purpose was to control inflation, or it was to obtain necessary production for war, and except as to that phase of the economy affected by increased production, the cost of living did not enter into the calculation.

Now, in this bill the Senate adopted what was known as the O'Mahoney amendment. The conferees amended that amendment so as to spell out again the authority contained in section 2 (e) of the original Price Control Act as it applies to food, and only as it applies to food.

Mr. CELLER. So that you still have incentive payments to increase production as to food; is that correct?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. CELLER. And what is the amount that is provided for that purpose?

Mr. STEAGALL. There is not any appropriation and there is not any limit as to the money that can be spent. The only limitation in the bill, the only fund mentioned is a limit upon the losses that may be sustained in connection with carrying out the food program. It does not deal with section 2, the buy-and-sell provision, except as it relates to the production of food, and it provides that it shall be under the control of the Food Administrator.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I just wanted to ask the gentleman one question. Does this relate to the noncompensatory cargo war-risk insurance or reduced freight rates for agencies such as the War Shipping Administration?

Mr. STEAGALL. I am not sure that it does.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter addressed by the War Shipping Administration to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. This letter was identical with the letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Senate. The letter was written by Admiral Land, War Shipping Administrator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

JUNE 28, 1943.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,

Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: The bill (H. R. 2869) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States as it passed the House, contained section 6 prescribing certain prohibitions and limitations on payment of subsidies by the Government or any agency thereof with respect to agricultural commodities.

The bill as amended in the Senate contains in sections 5 and 6 amendments of comparable purpose.

Inasmuch as the activities of the War Shipping Administration were referred to in the course of consideration of the measure, and inasmuch as there may be some confusion and

misunderstanding as to the application, or intended application, of the amendments in question to the activities of this agency in respect of providing war risk marine insurance at noncompensatory rates and in fixing freight charges for transportation of certain commodities lower than might otherwise be fixed on a commercial basis, it is deemed desirable to call the history of these matters to the direct attention of the conferees on the Senate amendments to the House bill.

The activities of the War Shipping Administration in furthering the maintenance of price control and in helping to bear part of the war cost of transportation have been explained on various occasions to the Congress and its committees. These activities may be summarized by stating that this agency in respect of marine insurance and ocean freight rates does not, in certain cases, charge sufficiently high rates to absorb all the war cost involved.

On July 20, 1942, the Honorable S. O. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, included in his remarks (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6398 and ff.) the memorandum and correspondence relating to reduction of ocean freight rates on certain coal and petroleum products, reduction of war-risk insurance rates on coal and petroleum products, and lifting the war surcharges otherwise applicable to ocean freight rates between the mainland and the Territories and possessions.

The Congress had considered the problem of, and authorized, governmental assumption of wartime increases in transportation costs arising from marine war-risk insurance during the consideration of legislation which became Public Law 523, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1942.

The policies and activities of the War Shipping Administrator with respect to these matters were set forth in House Report No. 2572, Seventy-seventh Congress, on the bill H. R. 7424, and again in House Report No. 107 on the bill H. R. 133. This portion of the report reads as follows:

"The Administrator also performs very important functions in the conduct of the economic phases of our war effort, especially in connection with the battle against inflation. Freight rates established by the Administrator for ocean transportation and the insurance rates charged in connection with the insurance of vessels and cargoes have a direct bearing upon the cost of goods imported to the United States and exported to our allies or friendly governments. Under Public Law 523, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Administration has authority to adjust its insurance rates in order to meet the economic, strategic, or military considerations of our war effort. Under its general operating authority, the Administrator may adjust his freight rates to conform to the same requirements. Under these powers, the Administrator has made insurance available at noncompensatory rates so as not to interfere with the price ceilings established by the agencies entrusted with the development of economic policy and so as to assist in the maintenance of satisfactory economic and political relations with our allies or friendly neutrals. Noncompensatory freight rates have also been provided where required by our economic or military needs. As a consequence, shippers or consignees of ocean-going cargo are not required to assume the full extraordinary cost of transportation resulting from the war effort. This cost, which largely represents war-risk-insurance expenditures, extra cost of voyage delays resulting from convoy and black-out operations, the cost of crew bonuses and many other factors, in reality constitutes part of the cost of conducting the war and should properly be borne, at

least to a large degree, by the taxpayers as a whole rather than by any group of shippers or consignees."

Most recently, during the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee on the national war agencies appropriation bill, 1944 (H. R. 2968), there was a full discussion concerning the noncompensatory cargo war-risk insurance and the reduced freight rates for the transportation of petroleum products and coal. (See hearings, pt. I, pp. 604, 640-643.)

It is our understanding from the text of the provisions in question and the debate in Congress, that these provisions are not designed and do not affect the policies and activities of this agency above discussed. There is, as was pointed out in the hearings of the national war agencies appropriation bill (p. 643), no actual payment of funds to anybody under these provisions. The revenues of this agency may be less than they might otherwise have been, but no payments are made from the appropriations of this agency in respect of the said activities.

However, inasmuch as the lowered rates fixed by this agency do apply to some agricultural commodities, particularly exports of food to Territories and possessions, if the conferees are of the opinion that the provisions in question apply to prohibit such lowered or noncompensatory rates by this agency or other agencies in respect of transportation or insurance, it is suggested that in connection with any language which may be adopted by the conferees, there be included a provision to the effect that nothing therein shall be construed to prohibit the payment of, or the absorption by, the Government or any of its agencies of the increased costs of transportation, including insurance, due to the war.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, Administrator.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think I have made this situation quite clear. We found that the Commodity Credit Corporation was making large purchases for the lend-lease program. It developed that there was no contractual understanding between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the lend-lease organization with respect to losses or expense of administration on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation. So that it means that the Commodity Credit Corporation was keeping open shop for the purpose of supplying such commodities and goods as might be required for the lend-lease program, with any losses that might accrue to fall upon the Commodity Credit Corporation. We did not think that was sound practice, and so the bill as amended provided that the Corporation should be reimbursed all money expended and all losses if any and services performed. The provision is broader than I indicated to the gentleman from Virginia. It is section 8:

Full reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, operating costs incurred, or commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or the Navy, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other Government agency, from the appropriate funds of these agencies.

The language of the provision is clear as the gentleman will see.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. The chairman read from page 3, section 6 (a) of the conference report:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any other commodity, etc.

Would the effect of this be to wipe out the Office of Price Administration insofar as it regulates maximum prices?

Mr. STEAGALL. Not in the least. It simply adds a provision which would require observance of the support price of commodities announced by the Department of Agriculture. If that were not provided, we would be in the unthinkable position of having one Government agency support one kind of a price, or nullifying a price established by another agency of the Government. The provision would not create the situation suggested.

Mr. McGRANERY. The effect, if the chairman of the committee will permit, would be that the Office of Price Administration must of necessity follow the recommendation as to the price of these products furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CELLER. The War Food Administration.

Mr. McGRANERY. The War Food Administration.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

In reference to support prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman intend to leave the impression upon the House that the War Food Administrator will have veto power over all prices of food commodities? I think that is the impression that is left with the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just interrogated the chairman.

Mr. STEAGALL. No, I do not think that is correct.

Mr. PACE. Is not he acting in an advisory capacity rather than in the capacity of complete authority and if there is conflict then the decision must be made by Judge Vinson, who occupies that position?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. May I ask a further question? Will the Commodity Credit Corporation be permitted to carry on its normal operations regarding the support price program?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. PACE. It will not be crippled in that regard?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, no. That is made very clear.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that section 6 makes it clear that you cannot under the provisions of section 6 place a ceiling on any commodity or livestock? This would, of course, affect over 20,000,000 people who have not received any

increase in their wages; this will bring about an increase in the cost of living that these people cannot stand, and I feel it would result in a great injustice.

We must take into consideration those people, the consumers of the Nation, and not only the few you are trying to protect by this program. I think it is an outrageous provision to say that no ceilings should be placed on any livestock or any commodity—that is, any agricultural commodity—and I feel it should be defeated.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, the gentleman is entirely in error in that both as to the language and the purpose of the bill. No such thing is undertaken, and no such thing is accomplished.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. As I understand, the \$150,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for roll-backs that have been already contracted for prior to July.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is entirely in error.

Mr. LYNCH. What is the \$150,000,000 for?

Mr. STEAGALL. The \$150,000,000 is the limitation of losses that may be incurred in connection with the food program authorized.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for two questions?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 29½ minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired, and the remaining time is under the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The House has heretofore prohibited incentive payments. Section 6 of this bill will prohibit subsidy payments. Section 7 will prohibit support prices. How does the gentleman from Alabama calculate that we are going to feed this Nation next year?

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, I do not agree with the gentleman's construction in regard to support prices. We even require the Price Administrator to support prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PACE. Well, certainly there is no question about the House voting this week to absolutely prohibit incentive payments. Certainly there is no doubt about section 6 of this bill prohibiting subsidy payments to anyone—farmers,

processors, or anyone else. Then section 7 of this bill reads as follows:

Sec. 7. The first sentence of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the authority conferred by this section with respect to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities, and the authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture by section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended, shall, in the case of any commodity used for food purposes, be exercised only with the approval of the War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322, as amended, and only in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of food to assure an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, for the essential civilian needs, and for carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941. Such authority to buy commodities used for food purposes shall include the power to buy them for the purpose of selling at a loss, but any such purchase for sale at a loss (1) shall be made only from the farmer at a price not less than the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, and not less than the support price therefor as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, or (2) shall be made in the open market at a price which will reflect such price (referred to in clause (1)) to the farmer; and no such purchase for sale at a loss shall be made for the purpose of reducing or rolling back any maximum price established under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided further*, That the War Food Administrator shall not approve purchases for the purpose of selling at a loss, except those required to carry out any program (other than a roll-back program) announced prior to July 1, 1943; and such approvals shall not involve losses in a total amount in excess of \$150,000,000. The Government agency or corporation making such purchases shall dispose of the commodities purchased as soon as feasible through the regular recognized channels and functions of trade and distribution used in free and independent enterprise; but no such commodity shall be sold or disposed of by any governmental agency or corporation (1) at a price below the price limitations imposed by sections 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this act or section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, or (2) contrary to the provisions of the last sentence of this subsection or the provisions of section 2 (f) of this act. No governmental agency or corporation shall buy any such commodity for the purpose of selling it at a loss except pursuant to the authority contained in this section."

Section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941, is what we commonly refer to as the Steagall amendment, and is certainly a most valuable provision of law, both for the Nation and the farmers. Under this section 4 the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to support certain prices to producers in order to secure increased production. This support can be either by loans or by purchase and sale programs. In many cases loans will not do the job and such purchase and sale programs are required. Naturally these often involve some losses.

This section 7 provides that these support-price programs which have been announced up to this date may be carried

out with the total cost limited to \$150,000,000, but it appears, as I construe it, that this section expressly prohibits any such purchase and sale programs involving any loss for the 1944 crop. I think that would be a terrible mistake, to prohibit these programs in the future, and I do not believe the Congress really wants to do so.

Under my construction of the provisions of this bill I am unable to vote for this conference report. I just do not understand how we can tie the hands of the Food Administrator, not only limit his funds but prohibit him from conducting any of the programs so necessary to secure the food we must have to feed our citizens, our armed forces, and a good many of our brothers in arms, and still expect him to do a good job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes. I think you will find by reading the conference report, that there is preserved in the language of the bill all of the prohibitions against the payment of subsidies for the purpose of reducing maximum prices and for rolling back prices.

We recognized that certain of these subsidy payments have accrued. To cut the date on which these accruals might have been paid off at the enactment of the bill, it was pointed out, might work some hardships, so we have given the agencies of the Government 30 days in which to liquidate and pay the subsidies which have accrued.

Following the enactment of the bill there can be no further commitments. So what it virtually means is that, should the President sign the bill tomorrow, or tonight, they have until August 1 to pay the subsidies which have accrued from the date on which the subsidy was announced up to the date of the enactment of the bill. But assuming that the President does not sign the bill for another week or 10 days, we still have a limitation in here that they cannot continue the program which has already been announced beyond August 1.

We provide also—and this is material, because many questions have been asked in respect to it—that any program that has been announced for canning vegetables, frozen vegetables, agricultural products preserved in brine, and any program that was announced before June 15 may continue throughout this crop year. That was necessary because some of the canners have agreed to take the crops at a certain price, and also necessary because the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to subsidize the increase in wages which was recently given to workers in canning factories; but beyond this crop year they can pay no subsidies for such purpose.

We have provided in section 7 of the act, which is a modification of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment, a limitation on section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act; and let us understand very definitely that section 7 applies solely to subsidies

or other payments made under the provisions of section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act. Subsidies can be made under section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act by the Price Administrator when he determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained; in other words, he is authorized at the present time to pay subsidies to obtain the maximum amount of production of any commodity. We limit that authority in section 7 by stating that when it is found necessary to subsidize food products the program, if he is to do it, must have been laid out before tonight at 12 o'clock, and even then it is limited to \$150,000,000.

Let me say in respect to the question asked by the gentleman from Georgia of the chairman that this does not in any manner affect any support price program because there are no support price programs under 2 (e) of the Price Control Act and if he will refer to section 6 of the act on page 3 of the conference report he will find this language:

SEC. 6. (a) No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof, a price below the support price therefor as heretofore or hereafter announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, nor a price below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942.

It is true that with the adoption of section 7 the Price Administrator or the War Food Administrator could not develop and announce and effectively put into execution a plan to subsidize support prices under the Price Control Act. They would be forced to increase the prices to absorb the differences. Applying that to a specific case, the support price of butter is 46 cents; the parity price of butter is 41 cents. We have specifically provided in this bill that no maximum price shall be set below the support price, which is 46 cents, and we prevent the rolling back of the price of butter from 46 cents, the support price, to 41 cents, the parity price. It is provided that that shall be taken care of by increasing the price so the producers will get their support price not by way of subsidy or roll-backs or out of the Treasury of the United States but by an increase in prices.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I wish I could follow the construction of the gentleman, but he will notice at the bottom of page 3 that the limitation of support prices is not confined to section 2 (e) but goes further and states:

And the authority conferred on the Secretary under section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941—

Which is the Steagall amendment under which the Commodity Credit Corporation is now operating about 30 support price programs; and, therefore, for

1944 those programs not having been announced on July 1 of 1943, they will all be prohibited.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They are supporting them by buying and selling.

Mr. PACE. By buying or selling. It will absolutely annihilate the program under the support price theory.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is not my understanding that the section will interfere with any support price programs because instead of supporting those prices by a subsidy they will support them by increasing the price to the consumer.

Mr. SABATH and Mr. HOPE rose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether this amendment would affect any program similar to those which are in effect now with the exception of the roll-backs on butter and meat.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know of any programs that are in effect at the present time which are not roll-back programs. The only programs which I know which have been announced which might have been announced under section 2 (e) are the butter program and the meat program. These are roll-back programs. The coffee program has not gotten to the point where it has been announced, and because we prohibit the payment of roll-backs this section would not apply; unless, therefore, a program is announced under 2 (e) previous to 12 o'clock tonight this does not apply anyway.

Mr. HOPE. Under this provision it would be possible next year, would it, for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce price support programs and for the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry them out as it has carried out such programs during this current year?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and then the only prohibition would be that they could not subsidize those support prices. They would have to increase the maximum price under section 6 (a) to offset it, in other words, if the existing price of butter was 46 cents and a new support price of 48 cents was announced they could not subsidize the other 2 cents—they would have to increase the price of butter 2 cents to absorb it.

Mr. HOPE. One further question on that point, if the gentleman will permit: That does not apply, however, to subsidies on fats and oils, as I understand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does not apply to competitive domestic vegetables, fats and oil seeds.

Mr. HOPE. The programs such as we have now will be carried on as they are now?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman explain the meaning of paragraph (c) of section 6 on page 3?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is to protect the packers in certain actions or claims which they have pending. I interpreted the language of the amendment which I

introduced here on the floor of the House to include that, because I considered that these claims would have accrued and that if the subsidies had accrued then they would have a cause of action against the Government for them. In the Aiken amendment this language was in here. It was more specific. It is in there specifically for the purpose of protecting any claim which anyone may have against the Government growing out of the accrual of subsidies. That was put in there designedly and specifically for that purpose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the adjustment of prices or sold below the support price?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think there is a contradiction between subsection (a) and subsection (b) of section 6, inasmuch as subsection (a) is a sweeping prohibition against any subsidies, and subsection (b) is a prohibition against subsidies but also has a qualification? I cannot read the language of the two subsections together and make up my mind what the law is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Subsection (a) has to do with maximum prices, and subsection (b) has to do with subsidies.

Mr. WRIGHT. Subsidies are the way you regulate your maximum prices?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. WRIGHT. If you are going to have a maximum price which is less than your supporting price, it is done by subsidy?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If you take the language of the House amendment, you will have subsection (a) following the prohibition against subsidies. The only difference is we have split them up and called them (a) and (b) and (c). Instead of making one long sentence, we state there is no subsidy to be paid, then we say that the maximum price shall not be below these standards to absorb the differential which will be reflected in the subsidies.

Mr. WRIGHT. All of these incentive payments and subsidies are going to be transferred to the consuming public under this plan?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let us make ourselves clear. I will not answer "Yes" or "No" without saying that we have not disturbed in this bill any of the subsidy or incentive-payment programs which are authorized for the purpose of increasing production.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to have the gentleman explain to the House how the supporting programs of the future will be operated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. By increase in prices.

Mr. COOLEY. By increase in prices. So the chairman's answer to my question a moment ago regarding the effect of the normal operations of the Commodity

Credit Corporation in the future being the same as in the past was not entirely correct, as I understand the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, a supporting price may be below or above parity. I can understand where, if the supporting price is below parity, then, in order to encourage maximum production, they might be authorized to subsidize perhaps up to parity. If it is above that, they will have to increase the price.

Mr. COOLEY. Does this act permit that to be done?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes a continuance of the support program. The only difference will be that unless the support program is for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of production, then the price must be raised. If the subsidy or if the support price is put on there to obtain a maximum amount of production, then they may subsidize under existing law.

Mr. COOLEY. You do not disturb that operation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, sir; very definitely we do not.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that under section 6 the sky will be the limit as to prices of all farm commodities?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. If the President or the Price Administrator wants to take the ceilings off, they may, and if they do, they assume responsibility for runaway inflation. Take butter, for example. There is no more reason why they should raise the maximum price on butter from 46 cents to \$1 merely because of this bill than that they set it at 46 cents in the first place. They have the authority to maintain that just where it is, at 46 cents. The only difference in your cost—and let this be understood—I repeat, the only difference in your cost of living which will result from the enactment of this bill as it is written now and the subsidy program of the O. P. A. is the amount that they roll back butter and meat products. In respect to butter, it will be a maximum of 60 cents a year, because that is all the butter you can buy, 12 pounds of butter at 5 cents a pound.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The language is very obscure in section 6. I would like to know what you mean with respect to the butter program. When does the roll-back take place under this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is only fair to assume that in respect to butter and meat products that they can continue these subsidies until August 1, but they must be liquidated in full on August 1.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does it mean that after August 1 they have to raise the price to take care of that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; that is right.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I would like to invite the gentleman's attention to section 8 and ask him whether or not it was intended by that language to nullify the action of the Congress heretofore taken in prohibiting the payment of subsidies out of the Army and Navy and lend-lease fund?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; this does not affect that.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No such intention whatever?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman mean section 8?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. That merely provides for reimbursement where the Commodity Credit Corporation is used as the agency.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record, and I also ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### COMMODITY CREDIT ACT EXTENSIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, all during the depression when unusual laws were passed, and during this war, the Congress has carefully guarded these laws by placing an expiration date on them or providing they should expire on the passage of a concurrent resolution or 6 months after the end of the war, or in some way has caused these laws to expire upon the happening of a certain event or at a certain time.

The Commodity Credit Corporation Act happens to be one of the laws passed during the depression. It expires tonight at midnight unless it is extended by Congress. This proposal is to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation Act for 2 more years and to provide \$750,000,000 additional to be used by that Corporation.

The Senate passed a bill and the House passed a bill providing for this extension. There is not a great deal of difference between the two bills. The conferees did not have much in conference to discuss or to change. Consequently, the bill that is before you now on this conference report is one that I personally would not favor if it were in an origi-

nal bill on the floor of the House for passage, but the situation is such that we must vote for the conference report to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We must legislate, we must do something. We cannot see this Corporation's life expire. In that situation, there is nothing left for us to do but approve this conference report.

#### VETO POSSIBLE

It would not surprise me if the Chief Executive vetoed this bill. If he did, his action would be consistent with his statements in the past. He has told Congress that if some other method was desired to prevent inflation to suggest it and it would be perfectly all right, but we are in the attitude of stopping subsidies and roll-backs without offering any other alternative whatsoever.

#### CONGRESS VULNERABLE

I personally believe this Congress is in a very vulnerable position for the reason that we have not done anything to siphon off excess purchasing power or otherwise effectively act to prevent inflation. Mr. Chester Davis called attention in his letter of a few days ago to the fact that we could not successfully administer subsidies in this country as they do in England and Canada because in those countries tax laws have been passed that siphon off a sufficient amount of the excess purchasing power so that the price-control problem is not a major one. Mr. Davis was exactly right, except I believe in some cases subsidies can be used to keep down the cost of living. The President in answering him called his attention to the fact that he has consistently and persistently called upon Congress to pass tax laws that would siphon off this excess purchasing power, but Congress has failed to do it.

The reason I say Congress is vulnerable is that, first, we have not siphoned off the excess purchasing power to protect the value of money and prevent runaway inflation, and, next, we are opposing things that the Executive wants, like subsidies, roll-backs, and things like that, which it is insisted can be used on certain commodities in certain ways to hold down inflation; yet we are offering no alternative whatsoever.

Further, the O. P. A., the only agency in existence that has for its purpose the keeping down of prices and price control—we crippled and injured seriously and retarded its effectiveness, if we did not destroy it, when it came before the House and we cut out a substantial part of its appropriation. Not only that, the Domestic Division of the O. W. I. has gotten up a coordinated and well-planned program to warn the people of the nature and dangers of runaway inflation, but we abolished that division entirely when the bill was in the House.

So, as far as the record is concerned, this Congress looks like an inflationary Congress.

I do not believe any Member of this Congress would advocate inflation. I think we are all opposed to it. Yet we are not doing a thing to stop inflation,

we are doing the things that permit and in fact cause inflation. The people of this country must be warned and must be told that it is necessary for them to pay another dollar in taxes to protect the other dollar they have left in their pockets. If they do not, the \$2 will not be worth 10 cents in the future.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman just stated that we had provided no way to drain off the excess purchasing power of the consumer, to stop inflation. How does the gentleman believe we would accomplish that fact by further subsidizing the consumers, if their purchasing power should be drained off?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not advocating subsidies and I am not advocating roll-backs, but sometimes you have to take something bad to keep from taking something worse. In some cases subsidies can be used to keep down the cost of living.

I am inserting herewith a copy of the letter from the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, to President Roosevelt, which was published June 28, 1943, in which Mr. Davis offered his resignation. It is as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Some time at your convenience I should like to discuss fully with you the future direction of the food program. After I have completed two undertakings I should like to be relieved of my present responsibility. The two unfinished jobs that I should carry further before leaving are:

1. Rounding out and announcing the general 1944 food-production program; and
2. Holding three meetings in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco that are essential in launching the broad food educational program.

These major programs should be well shaped up and under way before the middle of July.

Two main causes have brought me to the reluctant conclusion that I will not be able to serve you satisfactorily in my present capacity.

1. I find that I have assumed a public responsibility while the authority, not only over broad food policy but day-to-day actions, is being exercised elsewhere.

2. You must have in my position a man who can wholeheartedly advocate and defend the program of broad general subsidies you announced on June 15. I cannot do this for the reason that I do not believe such subsidies will be effective in controlling inflation unless they are accompanied here, as they are in England, by current tax and savings programs that drain off excess buying power, and by tight control and management of the food supply. We do not have in this country anything approaching these conditions.

Respectfully yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS.

I am also inserting herewith President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Reply to Mr. Davis. It is as follows:

#### THE PRESIDENT

DEAR CHESTER: I have given a good deal of thought to your letter of June 16, and your request to be relieved of responsibility for the future direction of the food program.

No one appreciates more than I do your ability in dealing with agricultural matters. But I am sure that you will agree with me that effective teamwork is absolutely necessary.

Before the Office of Economic Stabilization was established, differences as to prices and wage policies from time to time arose between the various war agencies which frequently had to be brought to me. The act of October 2, 1942, directed me to stabilize the cost of living so far as practicable on the basis of the levels prevailing on September 15 and authorized me to exercise my authority through such department, agency, or officer as I might direct.

Under that act, and before you accepted the office of Food Administrator, I set up the Office of Economic Stabilization and authorized the director, among other things, to resolve disagreements which might arise between the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator and to issue to them policy directives. If we are to stabilize all prices we must place the final responsibility in one official. I know of no better method of coordinating the work of the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator, although that method does require a willingness on the part of both administrators to accept the decisions of the stabilizing director. The country realizes that stabilization applies not only to food but to many other things, such as rent, clothing, and wage decisions. The broad objective is, of course, to prevent the cost of living from spiraling upward and the purchasing power of the dollar from spiraling downward.

I agree with you that we cannot fully or effectively enforce our price or rationing programs, or fully or effectively stabilize the cost of living, without an adequate tax and savings program to drain off the excess purchasing power. I have emphasized that fact in my budget message, in my statement on the hold-the-line order, and on other occasions.

#### HOLDS TO SUBSIDY PROGRAM

But because the Congress has not yet provided the tax legislation I have requested I cannot sit back and fail to advocate other measures, such as limited consumers' subsidies, which I am convinced can help to prevent the cost of living from getting completely out of hand. Of course you know that I also favor and have advocated such support programs and incentive payments to producers as will enable us to obtain the necessary war production.

I think you will also realize that I did not announce a program of broad, general subsidies at my press conference on June 15. I stated my views on limited subsidies in order to maintain farm prices and hold down consumers prices, and stated my willingness to give full and sympathetic consideration to any program which would accomplish these two ends. None has been offered me.

I am truly sorry that you feel unable to continue as Food Administrator subject to the coordinated controls which I have established and which I believe essential for the proper functioning of our war effort. But it would be unfair to you to insist that you remain in your position when you feel that, all things considered, you cannot wholeheartedly support a program to hold down the cost of living.

There can be no disagreement on the program for 1944, which you recently discussed with me. Everybody is agreed that far greater efforts must be made to increase production next year.

However, the result of such a program for crop maturing in 1944 will not make itself felt until at least a year from now. What I am concerned with is the objective of keeping the cost of essential foods down for the next 12 or 14 months. That, it seems to me, is of immediate concern to the country. The pay envelope of tens of millions of our citizens will not compensate them for great increases in their food bills.

In regard to the program for next year, I do not think that it would be advisable for you finally to determine and announce it. Whoever takes over as Food Administrator would then be called on to administer a program which he had no part in determining. That would really be a case of dividing authority.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

It will be noticed that Mr. Davis insisted that the reason he did not believe a program of broad general subsidies would work was because we do not have in this country a current tax and savings program that would drain off excess buying power as they have in England. It should be noted, however, that President Roosevelt was merely trying to do something, since Congress had failed or refused to carry out his program, that would siphon off the excess purchasing power. It should be noted that President Roosevelt said "Effective team work is absolutely necessary."

It occurs to me that Mr. Davis should have resigned from his position with the Federal Reserve Bank in St. Louis, which pays him an annual salary of \$25,000 a year. If he had resigned from that position, he would probably have been more cooperative and engaged in a more sympathetic way in the effective team work that President Roosevelt says is absolutely necessary.

#### NO COMPLIMENT TO MR. DAVIS

The Honorable Jimmie Byrnes and the Honorable Fred Vinson resigned from lifetime positions to take thankless and difficult jobs. They are to be commended for burning their bridges behind them and getting on the President's team to do a real job in wartime. If Mr. Davis had resigned from his position doubtless he would have had more incentive to work on the team and have been more considerate of the wishes of the Chief Executive. Mr. Davis' leaving as he did is not a compliment to him. The War Production Board and many other governmental agencies have dollar-a-year men who have been big executives in the biggest corporations in the country. They maintain their positions with the corporations that they represent and receive fabulous annual salaries. Naturally they, too, have less incentive to faithfully work on the team than one who has severed all connections. It is doubtless easy for such a person to find fault, demand more power, and finally quit and leave town if he cannot get everything that he wants. A serviceman who is inducted for \$50 a month cannot throw off his patriotic responsibility in such an indifferent fashion.

Possibly Donald Nelson's job has been more difficult for that reason, but I am sure that the number of men who have caused trouble for these reasons is very small, as the War Production Board has done a wonderful job which could not have been done without the aid and effective assistance of these executives of proven ability of big business.

While we should not restrain ourselves in deservedly criticizing one who leaves the Government's service in wartime in a huff without an adequate excuse or reason, we should at the same time give full credit to that other large group com-

posed of men and women who are patriotically rendering a fine service for our country in time of war without compensation or for a very small amount of compensation, and at the same time sacrificing comforts and pleasures to endure hardships and inconveniences in order to render the service.

It will be noted in the President's reply that Congress asked him to stabilize the cost of living as of September 15, 1942. This he has been trying to do. Attention is invited to the text of the President's reply to Mr. Davis. It discloses that he has tried to get Congress to do something about inflation by adopting an effective tax and savings program to drain off excess purchasing power, but Congress having failed to carry out his recommendations, he could not sit back and fail to advocate other measures, such as limited consumers' subsidies, which he was convinced would be of help in keeping down the cost of living and keeping prices from getting completely out of hand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I notice the conferees have brought back to the House a report containing a provision for auditing by the General Accounting Office the financial transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The language of this provision is substantially the same as that contained in the amendment I offered last Friday, when this bill was up for consideration in the House, which was voted down, with the exception of a clause that was not contained in my amendment, and which I consider very objectionable.

The clause I refer to is to be found in subsection (b) of section 3, which reads:

And shall not be made until the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have had a reasonable opportunity, not to exceed 90 days, to examine the report, point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report.

It is my understanding this language or language similar to it is to be found in only one other Federal statute, namely, Tennessee Valley Authority.

What possibly could be the purpose of this provision? Let us suppose the Comptroller General makes an audit of the financial transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation that does not suit this agency or the Department of Agriculture. These two bodies would then make what in effect would be their own audit. The two audits would then be submitted to the Congress. Which one would the Congress accept? That of the Comptroller General or the Commodity Credit Corporation and Department of Agriculture?

The work of auditing financial transactions is a highly specialized vocation. Certainly few men in Congress are fitted to offer scientific criticism of an audit made by the Comptroller General's office of the transactions of so large a business affair as that of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is hardly likely, there-

fore, that should two different reports be submitted they will receive anything but political consideration from the House. The Department of Agriculture and Commodity Credit Corporation will be sure to have their friends to support them in their position. To the degree this would be done the true audit will be weakened. How possibly can this be questioned?

I cannot conceive any other reason for putting this provision in the law than to provide an opportunity for this agency to doctor up its books.

Furthermore, if this language is permissible with respect to Commodity Credit, then why should it not be applied to all the other Federal agencies?

According to Senate Document No. 172, part 2, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, there are 15 New Deal agencies not subject to audit at all and 5 partially subject to audit. Following is a list of those partially subject to audit and those not subject to audit:

#### PARTIALLY SUBJECT TO AUDIT

- First. Commodity Credit Corporation.
- Second. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
- Third. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
- Fourth. Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
- Fifth. Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### NOT SUBJECT TO AUDIT

- First. Banks for cooperatives.
- Second. Disaster Loan Corporation.
- Third. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
- Fourth. Federal home loan banks.
- Fifth. Federal intermediate credit banks.
- Sixth. Federal land banks.
- Seventh. Federal National Mortgage Association.
- Eighth. Federal Savings and Loan Association.
- Ninth. Inland Waterways Corporation.
- Tenth. Panama Railroad Company.
- Eleventh. Production credit corporations.
- Twelfth. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
- Thirteenth. RFC Mortgage Company.
- Fourteenth. Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.
- Fifteenth. Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

Since the financial transactions of Commodity Credit are to be subjected to audit it may be expected these other agencies will also, in due time, be placed under audit. Will each one of them not be here clamoring for the same provision for fixing its books as the one contained in the bill before us? Certainly that may be expected. And what is to prevent all the other agencies of the Government which are subject to true audit from coming to Congress and asking for the same exemption as we are here granting to Commodity Credit Corporation?

I conceive this to be a viciously corrupting piece of legislation and as having in it the possibility of finally completely destroying the value of the General Accounting Office as regards the financial transactions of the various Federal agencies.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with a good deal the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said in addressing the House; at least in his conclusion that the House will have to share the responsibility if there is increased inflation in America, and apparently that is inevitable. We are skating on very thin ice and should take some constructive action before we recess.

I believe the House was correct in turning down the request of the President for the roll-back on meat, butter, and coffee and subsidies on farm commodities, because a vicious circle would have been started which would have cost the Government two or three billion dollars a year. On the other hand, I do not know whether or not the President will veto this Commodity Credit Corporation bill; but, whether he does or not, I do know that he will blame Congress, because he has already said so, for any more inflation. He made a public statement to that effect within the last week. Consequently, I am proposing the following resolution, which I hope will be adopted and I believe certainly should be adopted before we take a recess within the next few days:

*Resolved*, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a committee of seven Members of the House to study prices, wages, and rents and all matters connected with inflation, to sit during the session of the House or any recess thereof, and to report back to the House with recommendations for legislation by September 15, 1943.

Not only have we a right, but we have a duty to legislate. I think we will not be fulfilling that duty if we take a recess for 2 months and do nothing about this vital issue affecting all of the millions of consumers, particularly after we turned down the recommendations of the President for further price control. Therefore I am asking action by the Committee on Rules and the House to appoint a special committee to study the whole question of inflation and price control, adopt a policy or program, and report to the House by September 15.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the House unanimously adopted the Fulmer resolution which authorizes the House Committee on Agriculture to thoroughly and completely investigate the subject the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. FISH. Oh, no. This resolution is far more comprehensive than dealing with farm prices. This goes into the question of prices, wages, rent, and the whole inflationary spiral.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, the Fulmer resolution does not embrace rents.

Mr. FISH. Nor does it take in wages. This takes in wages, prices, and the whole question of inflation. I think it is our duty to do it before we recess. We must do it since we refused the administration's request for subsidies and roll-backs. I believe we are able and competent to place checks and limits on

future inflation in the House of Representatives. We have a right to do it and it is our duty to do it without evasion or delay. This is our opportunity. If this resolution is adopted, then I believe we can afford proper and adequate relief to millions of consumers, to those on fixed incomes, to the white-collar class, to dependents of veterans and disabled veterans, to the firemen and policemen, to civil-service employees and those receiving pensions, and to all wage earners. Something of this kind must be done and done at once or the Congress will be properly blamed for evading the issue and voting to take a recess regardless of the consequences of higher costs of living and inflation.

Mr. Bernard Baruch was right in 1940 when he suggested and urged placing ceilings on everything, including wages. The administration muffed the ball and by halfway measures and half-baked ones have added confusion and uncertainty instead of nipping inflation in the bud. Mr. Baruch is one of the ablest thinkers in America and has more vision than all the bureaucrats and brain trusters combined and far more practical experience and knowledge. His cooperation and suggestions for curbing inflation should be sought by the special committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I think the House and the country has a perfect right to question the President's sincerity in asking for a program in view of the fact that he has refused Chester Davis the privilege of coming to the White House to discuss a food program.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by George E. Sokolsky appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### ADMINISTRATION REMAINS INCOHERENT IN CRISIS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

A farmer sends me a photostat of a document entitled "War Production Program—1943 Farm Plan." This is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, and tells a farmer how much he can grow. These instructions are for this summer, when we are all being told that there is a shortage and we are all being propagandized to plant Victory gardens—although we are not being given gasoline to reach these aforementioned areas of agricultural provisioning.

This particular farm consists of 98 acres. The crop land consists of 74.5 acres. The farmer who ran this acreage in 1941 was permitted to plant 15 acres of wheat. His measurement was inaccurate or the sun, rains, and hard work blessed him and when the crop was harvestable, lo and behold! he had produced 19 acres of wheat. He was fined \$198 for producing.

#### CROPS RESTRICTED

In 1943, although he can use 74.5 acres, he has been allotted 20 acres of wheat, 4 acres of alfalfa, and 10 of potatoes—and no more. For this, he will receive a "production practice allowance of \$40.87." If he grows more,

he will be in trouble. There is also a provision which reads, "An additional \$15 may be earned by planting two acres of forest trees." Who wants forest trees when we need to eat potatoes? That man could plant the whole of his 74.5 acres if he could get farm labor, machinery, and gasoline to do it.

Now, I want to ask what is the sense of such restrictions? What good do they do us? What sense does it make to have any restrictions on agricultural production at all when there is such pressing need for more and more food?

#### INDEX TO WEAKNESS

This particular instance is an index to the weakness of Mr. Roosevelt's administration. It never gets organized. It works at cross purposes. It is so personalized that a bureau functions without regard to the necessities of the moment simply because it will not stop functioning when it is no longer needed.

The War Labor Board is another example of administrative maladroitness. Mr. Roosevelt actually faced two strikes, one on the part of John L. Lewis, the other on the part of the War Labor Board which took the position that if Harold Ickes made a sane and businesslike settlement of the coal strike, it, the War Labor Board, would resign in a body. In other words, nothing mattered but that this Board's face be saved.

Our mandarins are worse than the Chinese mandarins; the Chinese variety sometimes removed themselves from impossible situations by committing suicide as a service to their people. Our mandarins will not remove themselves from a public job no matter what happens to the country. Once they get on the public pay roll they hang on for dear life unless the corporations they have been attacking hire them away.

A couple of weeks ago the country thrilled to the thought that all this was to be corrected, that Byrnes, advised and assisted by Baruch, would put an end to these bureaucratic monkeyshines, that they would streamline administration. The weeks are passing but nothing is being done along these lines. No obstructions to efficient management of the country's business have been removed.

#### REORGANIZATION BARRED

I do not question the ability of either Byrnes or Baruch; but they are not being permitted to hire and fire, to reorganize, consolidate, amalgamate, and cut out the administrative nonsense that is distressing and perturbing this Nation.

Gov. Tom Dewey is standing out in front of the Republican parade because he is attacking the one dread evil which the whole American people is now recognizing—administrative incoherence. The people know that the administration is cockeyed. They still do not blame Roosevelt, because they say he is busy with the war, but any student of public opinion can recognize that what Tom Dewey says about the management of our business is making a deep impression upon a long-suffering, loyal, and patriotic people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gifford].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a strange doctrine that this bill will bring about inflation. Is it not better for the consumer to pay a higher price now and drain off some surplus funds rather than to force the Treasury to borrow money and the consumer to have to pay it back later on at a time when he does not make such good wages? This is largely the issue. As we have heretofore stated, during the last 2 years wages have gone up 40 percent, living costs 24 percent. Reasonable increases in the cost

of food are to be expected. The comments of the President endeavoring to blame us for a degree of inflation by this particular act does not hold water.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Ohio moves that the conference report on H. R. 2869 be recommitted to the committee on conference with instructions to the House conferees that the language contained in section 3 (b) be stricken out and that the following language be inserted in lieu thereof:

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1943, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office (in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions) and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation, under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVAGAN) there were ayes 160 and noes 32.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker I make the point of order that there is no quorum present and I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-nine Members have arisen; not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 33), which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed in the next to the last sentence of the amendment made by section 7 to strike out "sections 3 (a) and 3 (c) of this act or" and "or the provisions of section 2 (1) of this act."*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this is simply to correct an error which places a restriction upon the operation of this particular provision of the bill, not intended by the conferees.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman advise the House what the error is that the gentleman would like to have corrected?

Mr. STEAGALL. The error referred to is a provision in the original price control act which places a limitation upon the Price Administrator and which did not apply in this case and was not intended to apply; it was simply an error made in the haste of the committee's work last night.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three distinct respects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSHEY] may address the House today for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

(Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a resolution of Local 2213 of the United Steel Workers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the one hundred and fourteenth anniversary day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS APPROPRIATION, 1944

Mr. SNYDER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the military establishments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2996) "making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, and 6; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 403 (a). For purposes of this section—

"1. The term 'Department' means the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company, respectively.

"2. In the case of the Maritime Commission, the term 'Secretary' means the Chairman of such Commission, and in the case of Defense Plant Corporation, Metals

Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company the term 'Secretary' means the board of directors of the appropriate corporation."

"Provided further, That section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(k) All the provisions of this section shall be construed to apply to Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Rubber Reserve Company."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be used for any expense pertaining to (1) the instruction, education, or training of Class IV-E Conscientious Objectors in colleges, (2) the service of such conscientious objectors outside the United States, its territories and possessions, (3) the transportation of such conscientious objectors to or from any college or any such service, or (4) the compensation of military or civilian personnel performing any services with respect to the matters set forth in (1), (2), or (3) above after the enactment of this act, except any services which may be necessary promptly to terminate any such Class IV-E Conscientious Objector college or foreign service projects existing on the date of the enactment of this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available after August 31, 1943, for payment to or expenditure on account of any military or civilian personnel employed outside continental United States to paint or otherwise reproduce war scenes except by means of photography, or to paint portraits, or for payment to or expenditure on account of any military personnel within continental United States who engage in decorative art projects or painting portraits to the exclusion of regular military duties"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. BUELL SNYDER,  
JOE STARNES,  
JOHN H. KEHR,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
D. LANE POWERS,  
ALBERT J. ENGEL,  
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
JOHN H. OVERTON,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
H. C. LODGE, JR.,  
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in

the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Restores the provision proposed by the House, including the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation within the provisions of the law relative to the renegotiation of contracts, amended to include the Metals Reserve Company and the Rubber Reserve Company.

Amendment No. 2: Restores the limitation proposed by the House barring the use of appropriations contained in the bill for or on account of any person in a civilian status listed as a conscientious objector, rephrased and amended so as to cover costs incident to such liquidation as may be necessary.

Amendment No. 3: Restores the limitation proposed by the House barring the use of appropriations contained in the bill for painting war scenes or portraits, or for decorative art projects, amended to extend the effective date to August 31, 1943.

Amendment No. 4: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the limitation proposed by the House barring expenditures for educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry except for two years preceding completion of such education.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: Makes the provisions and appropriations in the bill effective from and including July 1, 1943, as proposed by the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,  
JOE STARNES,  
JOHN H. KERR,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
D. LANE POWERS,  
ALBERT J. ENGEL,  
FRANCIS CASE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5: Page 3, line 6, at the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment after the word "services" insert a comma and the following: "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61 be considered together. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 60: Page 48, line 19, strike out lines 19 to 25, and on page 48 strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Amendment numbered 61: On page 49, line 10, strike out "305" and insert "304."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House further insists on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves to recede and concur in Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall take 1 minute, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is a final effort to reach agreement with the Senate on the urgent deficiency bill, carrying appropriations for the payment of employees of all governmental agencies with the exception of the Army and Navy, by reaffirming the determination of the House to insist on its

disagreement to Senate amendment No. 60. This amendment, Senate amendment No. 60, is the much-discussed amendment eliminating the House provision denying use of any money appropriated in this or other bills for the payment of salaries of the three Federal employees charged with subversive affiliations.

The preferential motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 60 and agree to the same would mean the abandonment by the House not only of its proposal to deny money for the salaries of these three men but would establish a far-reaching precedent involving the relinquishment of the right to deny money for the salary of any employee appointed by the executive branch of the Government and would be, to that extent, a limitation upon the right of the House to initiate legislation denying money for any purpose, and the right—to that extent—to control the purse strings of the Nation. It is too serious a matter to be thus lightly determined on a motion to recede and concur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, we discussed this amendment on two other occasions, but this is the first time that we have an opportunity to vote on the proposition squarely, that is, whether or not we want to eliminate this prohibition against the payment of salaries to these three Government employees. As I stated yesterday, this issue is very fundamental. It is a constitutional issue, it is an issue that goes to the very heart of democratic government, it is an issue that involves the anti-Fascist character of this war. I believe the House has made a serious mistake. The overwhelming majority of Americans believe that you have made a serious mistake. This is the time to correct it and I hope the Members will support my motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is the Kerr amendment to eliminate three men from the pay roll. They are not discharged, and the operation is clearly within the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives.

I hope the House will vote against the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which eliminates the Kerr amendment, which was placed upon this bill when it was before the House. I think we should have a roll call on it so that everyone may have an opportunity of expressing his sentiments at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to recede and concur.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 71, nays 301, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

#### YEAS—71

Bender	Hale	Miller, Mo.
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Burchill, N. Y.	Hart	Myers
Burdick	Hays	Norton
Celler	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Coffee	Herter	O'Connor
Cooley	Hobbs	O'Konski
Crosser	Hull	Outland
Cullen	Jackson	Pfeiffer
Dawson	Kean	Ramey
Delaney	Kee	Robinson, Utah.
Dickstein	Kefauver	Rogers, Calif.
Dillweg	Kelley	Rowan
Ellison, Md.	Keogh	Sabath
Feighan	Kirwan	Sadowski
Fogarty	Klein	Smith, Maine
Folger	LaFollette	Smith, W. Va.
Forand	Lemke	Stearns, N. H.
Fulbright	Lynch	Voorhis, Calif.
Gale	McGranery	Weiss
Gavagan	McMurray	Wene
Gordon	Magnuson	Willey
Gorski	Mansfield,	
Granger	Mont.	
Hagen	Marcanonio	

#### NAYS—301

Abernethy	Cunningham	Holmes, Mass.
Allen, La.	Curley	Holmes, Wash.
Andersen,	Curtis	Hope
H. Carl	D'Alesandro	Horan
Anderson, Calif.	Davis	Howell
Anderson,	Day	Jarman
N. Mex.	Dewey	Jeffrey
Andresen,	Dies	Jenkins
August H.	Dirksen	Jennings
Andrews	Disney	Jensen
Angell	Ditter	Johnson,
Arends	Domengaux	Anton J.
Arnold	Dondero	Johnson,
Auchincloss	Doughton	Calvin D.
Baldwin, Md.	Douglas	Johnson, Ind.
Barrett	Drewry	Johnson,
Barry	Durham	J. Leroy
Bates, Mass.	Dworshak	Johnson,
Beall	Eberharter	Luther A.
Beckworth	Elllott	Johnson,
Bell	Ellis	Lyndon B.
Bennett, Mich.	Ellsworth	Johnson, Okla.
Bennett, Mo.	Elmer	Jones
Bishop	Elston, Ohio	Jonkman
Blackney	Engel	Judd
Bland	Fellows	Kearney
Bolton	Fenton	Keefe
Bonner	Fish	Kennedy
Boren	Fisher	Kerr
Boykin	Flannagan	Kilday
Bradley, Pa.	Gamble	Kinzer
Brehm	Gathings	Kieberg
Brown, Ga.	Gavin	Knutson
Brown, Ohio	Gearhart	Kunkel
Bryson	Gerlach	Lambertson
Buffett	Gibson	Landis
Burch, Va.	Gifford	Lane
Busbey	Gilchrist	Lanham
Butler	Gillette	Larcade
Camp	Gillie	Lea
Canfield	Goodwin	LeCompte
Cannon, Fla.	Gore	LeFevre
Cannon, Mo.	Gossett	Lewis
Carlson, Kans.	Graham	Ludlow
Carson, Ohio	Grant, Ala.	McCord
Carter	Grant, Ind.	McCormack
Case	Gregory	McCowen
Chenoweth	Griffiths	McGehee
Chipfield	Gross	McGregor
Church	Gwynne	McKenzie
Clark	Halleck	McLean
Clason	Hancock	McMillan
Clevenger	Hare	McWilliams
Cole, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Maas
Cole, N. Y.	Harris, Ark.	Madden
Colmer	Harris, Va.	Mahon
Compton	Heidinger	Maloney
Cooper	Hendricks	Manasco
Costello	Hess	Martin, Iowa
Courtney	Hill	Martin, Mass.
Cox	Hinschaw	Mason
Cravens	Hoch	Morrow
Crawford	Hoeben	Michener
Creal	Hoffman	Miller, Conn.

Miller, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.	Sundstrom
Miller, Pa.	Richards	Taber
Mills	Rizley	Talbot
Monkiewicz	Robertson	Talle
Monrone	Robison, Ky.	Tarver
Mott	Rockwell	Taylor
Mruk	Rodgers, Pa.	Thomas, N. J.
Mundt	Rogers, Mass.	Thomas, Tex.
Murphy	Rohrbough	Thomason
Murray, Tenn.	Rowe	Tibbott
Murray, Wis.	Sasser	Towe
Newsome	Satterfield	Troutman
Nichols	Sauthoff	Vincent, Ky.
Norman	Schuetz	Vorys, Ohio
Norrell	Schwabe	Vursell
O'Brien, Ill.	Scott	Wadsworth
O'Brien, N. Y.	Shafer	Walter
O'Neal	Short	Ward
Pace	Sikes	Wasielewski
Patman	Simpson, Ill.	Weaver
Patton	Simpson, Pa.	Welchel, Ohio
Peterson, Fla.	Slaughter	West
Peterson, Ga.	Smith, Ohio	Whelchel, Ga.
Philbin	Smith, Va.	White
Pittenger	Smith, Wis.	Whitten
Ploesser	Snyder	Whittington
Poage	Sparkman	Wickersham
Poulson	Spence	Wigglesworth
Powers	Springer	Wilson
Pracht	Stanley	Winstead
Price	Starnes, Ala.	Winter
Priest	Steagall	Wolcott
Rabaut	Stefan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ramspeck	Stevenson	Wolverton, N. J.
Randolph	Stewart	Woodruff, Mich.
Rankin	Stockman	Woodrum, Va.
Reece, Tenn.	Sullivan	Worley
Reed, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.	Wright
Reed, N. Y.	Summers, Tex.	Zimmerman

#### NOT VOTING—59

Allen, Ill.	Furlong	O'Hara
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	O'Leary
Barden	Green	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Hall	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Brooks	Hall,	Rivers
Buckley	Leonard W.	Rolph
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Russell
Burgin	Hébert	Scanlon
Byrne	Holfield	Schiff
Capozzoli	Izac	Sheppard
Chapman	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Cochran	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Culkin	King	Tolan
Dingell	Lesinski	Treadway
Eaton	Luce	Van Zandt
Fay	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Fernandez	May	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Wheat
Ford	Morrison, La.	
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baldwin of New York for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.  
 Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Eaton against.  
 Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Lesinski against.  
 Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Treadway against.  
 Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Phillips against.  
 Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Kilburn against.  
 Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.  
 Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.  
 Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Hartley against.  
 Mr. Somers of New York for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.  
 Mr. Holfield with Mr. Ward Johnson.  
 Mr. King with Mr. Gallagher.  
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
 Mr. Izac with Mr. Culkin.  
 Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mrs. Luce.  
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. O'Hara.  
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Rolph.  
 Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Van Zandt.  
 Mr. May with Mr. Welch.  
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Schiffer.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Plumley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate, and on that I desire recognition.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1134) entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and Mr. McNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1134, the emergency flood-control bill, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. WHITTINGTON, ALLEN of Louisiana, ELIOTT, CLASON, and CURTIS.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the privilege of service in this House is one that comes to but few people in the country. Five times I have been elected to serve in this body. For 8½ years now it has been my pleasure to be among you. No one could appreciate this honor and this distinction more than I do. The task I have assigned myself today is a heart-breaking one.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to advise you that I have resigned my seat in the House of Representatives, effective July 3, 1943.

In taking my leave of you, I want to thank you all for your courtesies and kindnesses to me, which have been far beyond my deserts. No matter what fate may hold in store for me, the years spent in this Chamber and the friends that I have made here shall always be a treasured possession.

I never had a more difficult task to perform than this one. Even now I hesitate and pause.

I arrived at my decision to take up this new line of endeavor only after long and sober consideration.

If I felt I could best serve by remaining here, I would do so, no matter how great the sacrifice to myself. However, by temperament I am eager for action, and since the pattern for victory has been pretty well shaped, I feel that I can best serve by passing on to this new field of endeavor.

My new position with the aviation industry will deal with the promotion of American civil aviation to a world-wide factor. This is most important, since we expect the aviation industry to not only furnish employment for a great number of servicemen when they return, but also to be a factor in maintenance of world peace and the promotion of world commerce in the better years that will follow the war.

Full well I realize the weight of the cares and duties which the Members of this body carry, and I do not intend to depreciate in any degree the important work that must be carried on here. The problems which this House will face in the next few years are such as to require weeks and months of close application and study. A balancing and weighing of different proposals and methods, patience and determination, and ability to bear up under the unfortunate and unfair attacks of unlearned critics.

Never shall I cease to be grateful to my colleagues for the liberal education which they have given me. The defeats and victories which I have passed through in this chamber have sharpened my wits, elevated my vision, tempered my ambition and shown me the error of some of my ways. Your debates have inspired me with love of country, your counsels have given me new insight into the hearts of men and your friendship has shown me the real meaning of that word.

I leave the House of Representatives with the firm conviction that it is the real rock of democracy in the Nation. Here are the real representatives of the people. The Members of this body are on the job every day. They represent changes in the opinion of the people better than a Gallup poll. The House knows what the people feel, and the action of the House reflects the views and wishes of the people.

The other body of the Congress may make decisions of more wisdom and based upon calmer reflection, and sheltered from the hurricanes of passion—but this House is the real and authentic voice of the people. As long as the House stands, with its authority unchallenged, the people have a champion; the people cannot be oppressed.

Yours is a great responsibility. It is you, if every other agency of Government fails, who must finally preserve our American institutions, and safeguard free enterprise.

If I could leave behind me one warning or one suggestion for a simple prescription which would best guarantee these things, it would be:

Never to permit to die the two-party system. I think that nothing more disastrous could happen to this Nation than that the two great parties of this country be amalgamated into one. If there is any one thing more important than an honorable, intelligent, fearless, majority, it is a healthy, well-informed, vigorous minority. Only by the preservation of this system can we be sure that dictatorship shall never overtake us.

It is proper that everyone should have the right to criticize individuals in Government, be they in the executive, judicial, or legislative branch of the Government.

But no one should be heard to criticize any of these as an institution.

Therefore, no one in this body should ever stand idly by and hear the Congress of the United States maligned as an institution.

You must know there is a group in this country who are exerting diligent effort to discredit and, if possible, destroy the Congress of the United States.

Always, wherever I may roam, it will be my pleasure and privilege to defend the House of Representatives and its Members from attack and vilification.

Among my fondest recollections will ever be my association with the three great Speakers of the House under whom I served. Joe Byrnes gave me my first lessons in parliamentary procedure and the traditions and history of the House. He was a friend and a kindly and tolerant teacher. Will Bankhead continued my training and encouraged me to express my opinions freely. Then he showed me how to clothe these opinions so they would be more attractive. He helped me as he did many others in his patient and kindly way. Then came my service under the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, our present Speaker, who has been a model to us all in the statesmanlike manner in which he has borne the burdens incident to the greatest war in history. Never too busy, despite the tremendous cares of his office, to take time for personal consultation with any of us—knowing and understanding our problems as Members of the House, as well as the problems confronting the Chief Executive and the other departments of Government in this hour of peril—I think it is not too much to say that the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, has proved himself to be one of the outstanding men of our generation. And his stature increases with each added responsibility and each passing day, as America in this time of world turmoil and strife proves that our form of government is best in war as it is most beneficial in peace.

In the years to come, if it should again be my duty to perform public service, I hope that this call will bring me back to this House. I am certain should I return here as a Member in the years to come, there would be many changes. But should I ever return, I am also sure that I would find many friends here, for among you are some of the truest and best friends that I have ever had. Among you are the greatest statesmen of the Republic—leaders who will carry Amer-

ica forward to a new height of glory in the days when peace shall come again.

So I bid you adieu as a colleague. I now become one of your constituents. Tax me, regulate me—yes—even investigate me, as you wish. I know you and trust you. Should my services ever be needed to help our country, I am at your command.

Finally, my friends, I leave you with this pledge: I pledge you that I shall never knowingly do anything which will give you cause to regret the trust and the confidence you have reposed in me.

Now, good-bye, and God keep you.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of genuine regret that I learn of JACK NICHOLS' resignation from the National House of Representatives. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], as we refer to him under the rules, although we can shortly refer to him as JACK NICHOLS even under the rules, came here in 1935 and was a Member of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Prior to his election to Congress he had a wide and varied career as a lawyer and businessman. He came to the Congress admirably equipped to perform his duties.

His sound judgment, his dynamic force, his diligence to duty, and his indomitable courage quickly made him an outstanding Member of this House. He has championed great and liberal legislation, which shall endure and stand the test of time.

As chairman of a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate civil and commercial aviation, he has made a notable contribution to American aviation. He has long been interested in aviation and has avidly studied all its phases. He leaves us to occupy an important position in this new industry which shall have such an important bearing on America's future.

His many friends in the House join with me in wishing him Godspeed in his chosen field of endeavor. We knew him as a kindly, warm-hearted, at times impulsive, almost overgenerous friend, as well as a notable statesman. He was always loyal to any cause he espoused. He was loyal to his friends.

We deeply regret his departure and hope that the future holds for him all the good fortune and blessings he so richly deserves.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, I am certain I speak the sentiment of each member, as well as the host of friends of our retiring colleague, in saying we are deeply grateful to our distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for his kind and appropriate remarks with reference to our colleague from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS. I am sure it is a source of great regret to all the Members of this House on both sides

of the aisle that our colleague from Oklahoma has of his own volition resigned his membership in this body to embark in the aviation world.

Many of us remember his predecessor, the late W. W. Hastings, who was one of the ablest Members ever to serve in this House. When JACK NICHOLS came here as a new Member 8½ years ago he made it plain that he did not expect to fill the place of Bill Hastings. He realized that no new Member could do that. But JACK NICHOLS began applying himself to the task before him. With his untiring energy, his devotion to duty, and his determination to make good, he soon had won the confidence, respect, and admiration of his colleagues. Moreover, having a marvelous voice, a keen mind, and a quick wit, JACK NICHOLS in due time established himself not only as an able and vigorous debater but also as an outstanding legislator. He possesses the happy faculty of making and keeping friends, and his resignation as a Member of Congress is a distinct loss to our State and to the Nation.

No Member of either House of Congress has more information on the important subject of civil aviation than he. As he has made good in Congress, I predict that he will also make good in his new field of endeavor.

Permit me to add that in offering congratulations and good wishes to our retiring colleague that the great aviation company with which he is to be affiliated is also to be congratulated in securing the services of our colleague at what I am told is a considerable increase in salary over that paid a Member of Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. As a member of the Oklahoma delegation, I second the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. We of the Oklahoma group hate to lose our tireless, effective, and efficient colleague from Oklahoma. Night was never too dark nor the storms too strong for Jack to go to bat when it was necessary in the interest of his State or in the interest of his country. He has served the Nation and his State well, not only through his membership on the important Committee on Rules, which membership brought great distinction to our State, and his service as chairman of a select committee on aviation, whose proceedings he so ably conducted, but in his other activities which extended through his brilliant career here in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have known JACK NICHOLS for a number of years. He like Will Rogers and Gene Autry and other notable Oklahomans, typifies the true pioneer spirit that exemplifies Oklahoma. He has a firm handshake and a ready smile. He is capable, he is honest,

he is efficient. I am sure we shall miss him.

Jack, I wish you success in your new undertaking. You certainly merit the confidence imposed in you. I congratulate the company in its wise selection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, on the high statesmanship expressed in his farewell message, and to join with him in the splendid tributes that he paid to the three Speakers under whom he has served.

This House is the better for JACK NICHOLS' service as a Member. Times have not always been so rosy among the Members, and sometimes Jack and I have had a word or two over local matters, but I have never served with a better natured, more big-hearted, forgiving chap than the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS.

I wish him the best of luck, Godspeed, and congratulations on his service here and his service to be with the institution which is fortunate enough to have secured his services.

I sometimes wonder what kind of a speech a man ought to make when he retires from Congress. I suppose a speech when he voluntarily retires would be of different character than when he retires involuntarily, but I hope that when I come to make one I can make one of the caliber that the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, made today, and that, too, will be on voluntary retirement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have known the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, quite intimately for a number of years. He is largely a creature of his own creation—the rough and tumble that has won against odds and adversities as much so as any man within my acquaintance. Jack has made good in every battle. He does not know what it means to be whipped and stay whipped. About the time his foes look for a final decision against him they find he is just beginning to go into battle.

I regret that we are losing him. It is going to be hard to replace him. I have enjoyed my service with him during these 6 short months.

May he prosper and make good par excellence in his new field of activity. More power to you, Jack.

HON. JACK NICHOLS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has just addressed this body indicating his plans to resign to enter a field of private endeavor. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to his past endeavors and bid him Godspeed in his new task.

It is fitting that we pause here in the midst of a day of unusual endeavor, even conflict, to wish Jack well in his new choice. His has been a militant spirit

always with a shoulder to the wheel, or if there was division amongst us, always in the thick of the fray fighting for his conviction.

It has been my privilege to know Jack more intimately than most of you, perhaps, and I know him to be a man with a great heart, real capacity, and strong purpose. I have treasured our friendship especially because he has proven himself loyal and everlasting as a friend, broad gaged, and high caliber.

All who have had Jack as an advocate of their cause have found him able, ardent, and fearless. All who have had him as an adversary on an issue have found him unyielding, determined, forceful, ever militant and aggressive to carry his point. In victory he has always been modest and magnanimous. In defeat he has ever been the best of sports entertaining neither bitterness nor rancor.

His achievements here we will ever hold in high esteem and point to justly with pride. His has been a leading role, his a service of no ordinary kind. The Congress I know regrets his departure even though it be a task of great importance carrying with it personal good fortune that calls him forth. The Oklahoma delegation especially deplore our loss in his gain in his new adventure and only our intense good will for Jack personally can mitigate our regrets.

Congress loses today the highly capable energies of one of the very best among us but America gains for one of our greatest and most vital industries a good hand and a great mind.

I predict that Jack will make his mark high on the scoreboard of aviation's history. And with the deepest earnestness I bespeak my regret at his going but extend my constant friendship and my everlasting faithful good wish to attend his every endeavor.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

#### DEFENSE HOUSING—INCREASED AUTHORIZATION

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) to increase by \$300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2975, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that in the debate on the rule many matters were mentioned which have no connection whatever with the bill now before us for consideration. It is unfortunate also that, although the House votes without a dissenting voice for many billions of dollars to conduct various plants that are necessary in our war effort, having appropriated within the last month more than \$100,000,000,000 unanimously for this purpose, it always seems to gag a little when we bring up these measures which are relatively small in amount in order to make those plants effective in their operation.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about this bill and the act which it seeks to amend. I wish to call your attention, in the first place, to the fact that it is decidedly and wholly a war measure. The act has to do only with the duration of the war. It becomes ineffective when the war is over.

The purpose of this act is to furnish living quarters for industrial workers in these various plants to the extent that housing is not already available and cannot be furnished by private capital. Not very long ago the President of the United States sent to the Congress a recommendation for an authorization of an additional sum of \$400,000,000 for this purpose. The Senate on yesterday passed a bill similar to this, providing for \$400,000,000 for this purpose. Now, some have had the hardihood to rise on this floor and say that three-quarters of the amount recommended, \$300,000,000, which is the amount reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, is entirely too much. In the first place, compare it with the more than \$100,000,000,000 voted in the last month for the operation of these various plants. Over against the testimony of these gentlemen who cannot be thoroughly versed in the matters concerned, we have testimony in the form of a message from the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our forces; we have the statement of the Secretary of War; we have the statement of the Under Secretary of the Navy; we have the testimony of the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, the workers who occupy these various dwellings, and the private real-estate people of this country, that this money is necessary for this purpose.

I would call your attention to the fact that it is recommended by private builders of the United States, as well as by those who have charge of such public construction as may be necessary. Now, this is a colossal undertaking. Of course, mistakes have been made. Perhaps other mistakes will be made, but the mistakes which were referred to in the debate on the rule have nothing in the world to do with this measure and did not arise in connection with any

funds that were authorized by bills from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

I wish to call your attention further to the fact that every penny of this money to be authorized here is to be used for temporary construction. The committee will present three committee amendments to further amplify the provisions of existing law, to assure the temporary character of this construction, and when we return to peace, private industry will be left as it should be left, to the matter of the necessary real-estate construction in this country.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What provision, if any, is made in the legislation to protect private industry in the construction of these homes if the facilities are in those areas to build those homes, rather than the Federal Government?

Mr. LANHAM. May I call to the attention of my good friend from Michigan the fact that the private builders appeared before us through their representatives.

The War Production Board and its representatives, the National Housing Agency and its representatives testified before the committee. They stated that priorities will be given for private construction for living quarters for these war workers to exactly the same extent that they will be given for public construction, and there is an absolutely harmonious agreement between the War Production Board, the National Housing Agency, and private building industries in that respect, and private industry is also urging the passage of this measure.

Mr. DONDERO. I am very gratified to hear that explanation, because in some areas, particularly in the Detroit area, there has been some complaint that private industry was not protected in the building or construction of homes as against the Federal program.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and that has been true formerly to a great extent, but those objections have been obviated, and there is now agreement satisfactory to all parties concerned.

With reference to the need for these buildings, if you will look on page 43 of the hearings, you will see the allocation by States of the buildings to be constructed. Of course, it will be readily understood that it is not advisable to place in the Record the various localities, because that would have a tendency to enhance the cost of whatever the Federal Government might have to acquire in carrying out these projects.

We had 2 days of executive hearings, when the witnesses who came before us were from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission. The Navy Department and the War Department gave us their respective needs, and I have them here by their various locations. Of course, they gave us that testimony confidentially.

The Navy representatives testified that the Navy will need for its various shore stations and installations, 175,000 units during the next year.

The War Department outlined the number of units it would require. The Maritime Commission said that it would likely need 15,000 units but would try to get along with 10,000 units.

In addition to the needs of the War Department and the Navy Department, as well as the Maritime Commission, there are a great many industrial concerns which are making things for the Government and which are not directly connected with the Army, the Navy, or the Maritime Commission, which require this housing.

We held hearings for over 4 weeks. The printed hearings include 281 pages. We had several days of hearings in executive session. We have gone into this matter very carefully, and all of the authorities who have had to do with such construction and all of the workers who have to be accommodated by such construction at these various plants have appeared before us by representatives in support of this legislation.

Let me call to your attention the fact that even in those plants which are not being enlarged or extended they are increasing the number of shifts of workers and that means additional housing is necessary also.

Personally, I believe that there will be full need for the \$400,000,000 which the President requested, but the committee has reported out this bill for \$300,000,000, and, in my judgment, there can be no reasonable doubt on the part of anyone familiar with the circumstances that this sum will be required for the necessary construction of the temporary quarters to take care of these various workers.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It seems to me, from the information that I have received from the people in the city of Detroit, that the people engaged in private building construction could construct two or three times the number of houses that they are now constructing if they were allowed priorities. The whole question gets down to the question of materials, and naturally this building material is being allocated either to private builders or to the National Housing Agency for construction purposes.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to my friend the gentleman from Michigan that priorities are going to be extended on exactly the same basis, and the private people who appeared before us, with respect to that question, are in favor of the bill.

Mr. SADOWSKI. My own feeling on this housing matter—and I think it represents the feeling of 95 percent of the people in the city of Detroit—is that these houses should be constructed by private builders, under an F. H. A. program, and that priorities on all materials that are available should be given to them.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman will understand that this legislation is only for the duration of the war, and that is the reason we are going out of business under this act when this war is over. But in many of these instances, with these temporary living quarters, private

capital cannot run the risk of building them because there will not be a return to justify the investment unless the war should go on for years and years and years.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the gentleman how these houses are going to be built—whether they will be constructed on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis or by letting them out on competitive bids?

Mr. LANHAM. The contracts for their construction are going to be let to the lowest bidder. There has been very little under the administration of this act of the negotiated contracts. They are let under competitive bids.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is satisfied that we will get value received?

Mr. LANHAM. We expect to because we are now using much less critical material and we have reduced very materially the cost of these various dwellings.

Mr. JENSEN. Where are the places where these buildings are to be erected?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. I wish to reserve my time after that.

If the gentleman will look at page 43 of the hearings, and copies of the hearings are available, he will see the allocations by States. We cannot put them in by localities, because that would just make it more expensive for the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. And the gentleman is satisfied that these houses are needed.

Mr. LANHAM. There is no doubt about it in my mind. Many Members have come to me and testified that in their own districts in the operation of plants they are needed.

Mr. JENSEN. I am wondering if there is to be no end to the building of these houses.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me ask the gentleman: Will there be any end to this matter of appropriating billions of dollars for war purposes? We have appropriated without a dissenting vote over one hundred billion dollars for these plants in the last month, and this bill, I think, amounts to less than one-half of one percent of the money that has been appropriated for these plants.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. I have heard some testimony to the effect that there was a prejudice against the use of prefabricated houses. Can the gentleman enlighten me on that?

Mr. LANHAM. The law does not provide for any particular kind of housing, whether it should be ordinary construction, prefabricated construction, or otherwise. It is the purpose of the administrators to use the various kinds of housing available within the cost limitations in order to keep these various people in business and in order to have the construction as economical as possible at each particular place.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: Down in southern Indiana there is a manufacturer of prefabricated houses.

Mr. LANHAM. There are some in my State also.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. He claims that he has been adversely treated by this administration in the use of this type of house.

Mr. LANHAM. They recently came here from all over the country and we had a conference with them at the end of which they expressed themselves as being very well pleased.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has made a splendid presentation. He has carefully studied the whole subject. I wish he would tell us what provision has been made so that at the end of this war these buildings will not be left to compete with private dwellings.

Mr. LANHAM. They will not, and I shall present three committee amendments to be placed upon this bill to assure the temporary character of this construction.

Mr. GATHINGS. And may I ask what will become of the land that has been purchased for the purpose of building these projects?

Mr. LANHAM. Some of the land is only leased. Some of it, of course, was purchased. We shall have to make the best disposition we can of it. That is a question that will arise later, but this is purely a duration measure and this housing is to be disposed of. It is temporary housing and is to be taken out of the way at the end of the war.

Mr. GATHINGS. I trust the gentleman's amendment will carry out that purpose.

Mr. LANHAM. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for two questions?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Who is to determine where this war housing shall be established?

Mr. LANHAM. It is determined in several ways. The plants that need workers put in their applications and make their requisitions for the necessary housing. Then an investigation is made by the Federal authorities and also by the local authorities to determine the accuracy of those requisitions. The Army and the Navy, with reference to their plants, of course, advise the numbers of workers they are going to need at those plants and then a survey is made to determine what housing is already available, what can be constructed by private industry, and the remainder, of course, will be taken care of by these temporary buildings.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is a big country with conditions varying greatly from one area to another. Do these agencies differentiate as between cold climates and warm climates in the character of this building?

Mr. LANHAM. There is a different kind of construction for the different sections of the country.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE. The gentleman states that this was a temporary project. Can the gentleman state for the House just what disposition is contemplated of these temporary buildings after the war?

Mr. LANHAM. We expect to salvage the buildings as far as possible. If some of the farmers wish to buy some of these prefabricated buildings and move them on their farms, they will have the privilege, but we expect to get the Government out of this business absolutely.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I am heartily in accord with the purpose of the bill and what it is sought to do, but in my district we have 9,000 empty houses we are trying to get the Government to occupy.

Mr. LANHAM. Some of the vacancies are with reference to construction not yet completed and some with reference to plants that have reached their storage capacity and those houses may have to be occupied again. I do not know whether the houses to which the gentleman refers are publicly built houses or privately built houses.

Mr. MURPHY. They are privately built houses.

Mr. LANHAM. Then they do not come at all under the operation of this act.

Let me make this point: The National Housing Agency, of course, is not responsible for any vacancies that exist for the reason that when the War Department or the Navy Department says, "We are going to operate at such and such a place and we have to have so many houses there," then it is the business of the National Housing Agency to see that the quarters are available for those people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

It may be that subsequent changes in the plans of the Navy Department and Army account for some of the vacancies. A powder plant may have reached the point of saturation and some of the buildings be vacated, but later those buildings are likely to be occupied when the plant resumes its operation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I may say in my home town the Government constructed 350 houses. There are great defense plants there. Less than half of those houses are now occupied. They are standing idle in that community.

Mr. LANHAM. That may be true but, if so, there is a reason. You will understand that with approximately 2,000 of these projects all around over the country it would take the administrative authorities to give you the details about any one of those projects. We who serve here legislatively cannot possibly do that and it is not possible to answer those questions from the floor.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Referring to the list on page 43, that includes only the States. May I ask if the committee deliberation covered the Territories and notably the Territory of Hawaii?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, yes; the Territory of Hawaii is covered.

Mr. FARRINGTON. There is a very serious shortage there at the present time.

Mr. LANHAM. The Territories are included. We do this construction in the continental United States and without the continental United States wherever it is necessary to carry on our war effort.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is it not the case that a great part of the construction under previous allocations from our committee was permanent construction, and for that reason some of the demountable houses were not used?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MCGREGOR. In this appropriation it is all for temporary structures?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. There are no permanent structures carried in this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it contemplated to have all of these in an unfurnished condition, or does the act propose to legalize and authorize the Housing Authority to furnish these homes complete?

Mr. LANHAM. I think they have put temporary furniture in some of these homes and tried to make up for that in the rent because there were some instances in which workers could not bring their household effects with them, but for the details with reference to that I refer the gentleman to the administrative authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] as he desires.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt, from a hurried reading of the hearings on the pending bill, that there are many areas in this country badly in need of housing for war workers. However, I rise to express the hope that we might have some better planning and a wiser outlay of any funds which might be appropriated, under the

authority we are today considering, than has been the case in the past.

Adjoining the Kingsbury ordnance plant, in the district which I have the honor to represent, the Government acquired some 775 acres of fertile farm lands and embarked upon a program of building 2,974 dwellings at a cost of some \$10,000,000. The addition of utilities, site improvements, commercial and administrative buildings, including one school, brings the over-all cost up to some \$13,000,000. We understood that these buildings were to have been ready for occupancy sometime last fall. I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. A. J. Parkin, housing manager of Kingsford Heights, as this project is known, under date of May 20, 1943, informing me that 134 units have been occupied.

It looks like Kingsford Heights is destined to be a ghost city even before it is fully ready for occupancy. Not only was there a case of bad judgment in ordering construction of this large number of homes at Kingsford Heights, but there has also been unwarranted delay in their construction, which may have in part contributed to the mistake which has been made. Let me point out an example of bureaucratic red tape which has interfered with the program at this site.

The contract for overhead electric distribution was awarded on June 6, 1942. The contractor immediately presented a complete material list to the Federal Public Housing Authority, which, in turn, filed the application with the War Production Board for the necessary priorities. After some consideration, the W. P. B. decided that there was too much critical material involved, and they asked Federal Public Housing for a complete new redesign of the system. These plans and specifications were then redesigned and again submitted to F. P. H. A. and, through them, to the W. P. B. last fall. The priority certificate was finally received by the contractor on January 2 of this year, and the contractor was then advised that it was too late for January allocations of copper. The copper was allocated for February, that the work could be undertaken by March, some 9 months after the contract was awarded.

If our armies in the field were throttled by such delays, we shudder to think of the consequences; such, however, is typical of the confusion on the domestic scene.

In the nearby cities of Walkerton and Knox, Ind., the housing authorities had constructed hundreds of temporary buildings for the workers at the Kingsbury ordnance plant. These were occupied in the early days of work at the plant, and when it became apparent that Kingsford Heights was destined to be a ghost city, efforts were instituted—probably to save somebody's face—to compel the residents of the temporary dwellings in the little communities of Walkerton and Knox to move into the newly completed project at Kingsford Heights. These people had lived in these communities for a year or more; their children attended schools in those communities; they had made church, business, and fraternal contacts, and had con-

sidered these communities as their home. Naturally they objected strenuously to the efforts to drive them from these Government-owned houses to another Government project located a very few miles away. These objections were registered with authorities in Washington and with the regional office of the F. P. H. A. in Chicago with the result that the effort was dropped. We hope that efforts will not be made to revive this mass removal of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, these thirteen millions put into this project must be paid for by the taxes and the savings of our American people. It is one of those extravagances which bring the cost of the war far above what it necessarily need be. If further funds are to be made available for the housing of war workers, the Congress must insist that they be expended more wisely and with better planning and thought given to the actual needs which exist than is apparent today from a trip through the ghost city of Kingsford Heights.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been defended on the basis of the small amount of money involved. May I remind the Committee that a 10-cent Defense stamp is a small thing, that the aluminum spoon which the little girl gave to the scrap salvage collection was indeed a small thing also, that the little pieces of scrap iron which we have asked the school children and others to turn over are small things; but when multiplied by thousands of cases it becomes large. Any contention that this authorization of appropriation is justified on the ground that it is a small thing certainly should not merit any consideration.

Our distinguished chairman mentioned the fact that this is a small appropriation compared to the billions of dollars which we have appropriated for other purposes and that it would materially aid the war effort. I wonder how 45,000 empty houses standing around all over the country today are going to assist in the prosecution of this war. Forty-five thousand dwelling units already constructed, and offered for rent, are standing idle today. What do those 45,000 houses represent? They represent more than \$100,000,000 of investment; money which was taken from these same little 10-cent Defense stamps and these small bonds that our children and our mothers and our workers are buying to support this war effort.

But that is not all. It represents 45,000,000 pounds of critical materials; mind you, 45,000,000 pounds of critical materials have been invested in those houses that are standing idle today, that are serving no useful purpose in the war effort, and that 45,000,000 pounds of critical materials have been diverted from the war effort. Pray tell me how that is aiding the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] it was stated by the speaker who preceded me that private capital, private builders,

had the same access to priorities as public builders. Did it ever happen to occur to you that a private builder has to go to the National Housing Agency before he can get 1 pound of critical material? By an agreement made on December 11, 1942, the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Administrator of the National Housing Agency entered into an agreement whereby the National Housing Agency was given the exclusive programming of the war housing.

Mind you, all housing today is war housing. We have no other housing.

Then the National Housing Agency is authorized to program private and public housing. Before private builders can get critical materials they must go to this National Housing Agency before they can carry out their housing program. That is indeed a national disgrace. If I had 30 or 40 minutes extra to spend today I would cite to you not only 1, 2, 10, or 20 examples of violations of American fundamentals, I would point out to you 100 such cases. When private builders have to go to the National Housing Agency, their competitor, before they can even think about building houses, it becomes disastrous. Permission to build must come from the National Housing Agency which has exclusive control of all critical materials allotted to housing. In other words, they have to go there and beg on their hands and knees for a little critical material. Private builders have been refused by their competitors a thousand times where they have been granted one priority. That is an absolute fact, and I have 60 pages prepared to present those facts to you today, as compiled in the last 60 days by an auditor, a certified public accountant, who has spent 2 months auditing and compiling these facts.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is absolutely right in that statement.

Mr. WILSON. That is absolutely right, and do not let anyone tell you anything different. I can prove every statement I am making.

The National Housing Agency, in agreement with the War Production Board, was granted exclusive diversion of all critical materials between public and private housing. I do not have time to go into this report; I will have to pass it all up. I just cite a few things I have noted down, and I wish I had time to point out to you the complete lack of an auditing system for these cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. My distinguished chairman on the floor of this House, just a few minutes ago, told the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee business was out. Let me remind you that right today the National Housing Agency is negotiating 150 cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. That is an absolute fact.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman made the statement that pri-

vate builders could not get priorities. Does that mean they could not get priorities in defense areas or in general home building?

Mr. WILSON. I will answer the gentleman in this way. They are in the position of a hungry child who is being permitted to have perhaps one-tenth of the food it would want. They are in the position of having to go to their enemy or their competitor and beg for crumbs, and they have to accept only such crumbs as they can get. When the distinguished chairman of my committee said that private builders had agreed to this, I say they agreed to it because it was the only recourse they had, as I have pointed out here, in this agreement they made with the War Production Board.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Does the gentleman think priorities should be granted for homes that are not in defense areas?

Mr. WILSON. Absolutely not; nothing but war houses in defense areas.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I might remind the gentleman that in my county in the last 2 years private developers have built over 10,000 houses and have 3,000 now under construction. They had no trouble getting priorities provided. They were building defense housing in line with the war effort.

Mr. LANHAM and Mr. SADOWSKI rose.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I will yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman give me 5 minutes?

Mr. LANHAM. I will give the gentleman a minute on this point.

Mr. WILSON. I did not ask the gentleman to yield me that.

Mr. LANHAM. I was going to yield the gentleman the time. It was shown in the hearings that private and public builders had exactly the same priorities for defense housing.

Mr. SADOWSKI. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that the statement made by this gentleman does not apply to the city of Detroit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry, I must go into this report and point out just a few projects.

Did you know there are 17,000 workers on the pay roll of the National Housing Agency, and did you know that 18 percent of that 17,000 are drawing \$3,800 or more per year, when only 3.8 percent of the people on the pay roll of the Government in other capacities are drawing that figure? That is more than the base pay of a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army today. Can you imagine that? It amounts to more than \$12,000,000 a year just to pay the people on this particular pay roll who are drawing \$3,800 a year or more.

I mentioned that we had 84 percent occupancy in these units, 316,000 completed, 45,000 unoccupied, 45,000,000 tons

critical material wasted, \$150,000,000 thrown away, to say nothing of man-hours and lumber wasted.

Now I want to mention a project or two with which I am familiar. The committee has heard about one of these several times, the Versailles project. I tried one time to get the committee charged with the responsibility of investigating this agency to go to that area to see for themselves before it got under way, but I did not succeed.

There the public builders erected 100 brick houses; nice houses. Forty-three of them are occupied. Fifty-seven percent of them are not occupied. They have taken in \$17,000 operating income and have spent \$28,000 in operating expense. In other words, it has cost 165 percent of the operating income to operate those houses.

I want to mention another project. They have programmed another group of houses within 13 miles of the town I was working in when I was elected to Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I appreciate the statement that my distinguished colleague from Indiana is making. In my home city of Connersville, the Government constructed 350 permanent houses. At this very moment less than half of those 350 houses are occupied.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; and they will continue to be unoccupied. The Kingsbury ordnance plant project was built in northern Indiana. I heard about that project some weeks after it had been programmed. I am on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and I think I am an authority on war housing needs. They did not need one single house.

The Federal Public Buildings Authority is erecting 2,970 houses at Kingsbury, Ind.; 286 of those houses were ready on March last, and 500 were made available the next month, and 1,000 the next month. They have never rented more than 242 of the original 286 houses that were complete in March, and yet they are continuing to build 1,500 more in addition to the 1,400 they have already practically completed. Even though they are going ahead and building these houses, even though they are also planning where they are going to move them when finished.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. I wonder if you know whether the houses at Burns City are occupied?

Mr. WILSON. The houses are not occupied. Two hundred and fifty of those houses were made available about a month ago. There are 23 people who have rented houses in that project. Twenty-one of those have moved in. Twenty-one, with 250 available. Now they are building 350 more. The executive officer, Captain Oberlin, told me that

they had passed their peak of employment and were on the downgrade. I have a telegram from that same area, received yesterday, which reads as follows:

Because of rapidly diminishing employment in this district we urge that work now being done in distress labor areas be transferred here where men and equipment are operating barely 35 percent production basis. Your cooperation is earnestly solicited. We await your response with deep interest.

That is signed "Will Herman." I do not know Mr. Herman, but I believe his observation is correct.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Private builders in my city were denied the right to build these war houses because of the fact they could not get priorities.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to say to the gentleman from Detroit, that that is the rule and not the exception.

Mr. SADOWSKI. For the last 2 years our private builders were practically forced out of business in my city, and we have had public housing whether we wanted it or not. A unit that cost the Government \$4,000—I will take you down and show you that any private builder in the city of Detroit could build the same unit for \$3,000.

Mr. WILSON. I have hundreds of illustrations right here to prove that the gentleman is absolutely correct. This is by an audit of a distinguished auditor on Capitol Hill.

Now let us see what the President said in asking for this money:

The size of this program founded as it is upon minimum absolute need.

What could be more ridiculous? What could be more absurd? In my opinion, the National Housing Agency has developed into a national housing scandal, a national disgrace, and therefore should be materially revised. I am not condemning the National Housing Agency in its entirety. I feel it my duty to select the rotten apples from the barrel which are threatening to spoil the whole barrel.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would like to have the gentleman insert as a part of his remarks the different housing authorities we have now.

Mr. WILSON. I have that. Prior to the President's Executive Order No. 9070 of February 1942 there were 16 different Government agencies building houses. Now they have brought those all together under what they call the National Housing Agency, and developed the Federal Housing Administration, the Home Loan Bank Administration, and the Federal Public Buildings Authority—3 outfits, but this audit as made in the last 60 days shows that every one of those 16 agencies is still functioning under this new organization. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. What kind of housing do they have in Burns City? Have you got the cost of those?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, I have the cost of the whole project.

Mr. LANDIS. It is a regular firetrap down there, is it not?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. I have the pictures here to show that a lot of these houses blew down before they were ever occupied, if anyone would care to look at the pictures. My contention is this, that this critical material which they have used to build these 600 houses if it had been diverted to private enterprise to build 100 houses, they would have been occupied and they would have been something in the way of creative wealth to that community. They would have been livable. It would involve private funds and not Government funds. I have not been a single place where the public housers have not told me they could build four houses for every one they are building today. I cite you one example, Los Angeles County, Calif.

Because of the red tape injected into this housing program by the National Housing Agency in the matter of priorities they have been necessarily curtailed to 450 a month, in order to let the Federal Public Housing Authority get in and get its share of the spoils. They formerly built 4,500 per month.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that private builders would have to go to the Federal Housing Agency before they could get a priority on building houses?

Mr. WILSON. That is exactly correct, and I defy anyone to challenge that statement.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANHAM. The statement of the gentleman is not correct, because the Federal Housing does not come in this.

Mr. WILSON. You are speaking of the F. H. A., and I say that the F. H. A. has to come to the National Housing Agency the same as public builders to get priorities?

Mr. LANHAM. They all have to get priorities from the War Production Board.

Mr. WILSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I want to correct that statement. I am sure my distinguished chairman does not want to make that statement.

I am going to read this statement: In December of 1942 the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Administrator of the National Housing Agency entered into an agreement whereby the National Housing Agency was to get, first, exclusive programming of all housing; second, exclusive control of all critical materials allotted to housing; third, exclusive division of all critical materials.

That is an exact statement which I copied here yesterday or this morning

from the statement on this matter by the War Production Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes because there are other Members who are interested in this matter.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if his purpose in yielding me additional time was so I could answer questions?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. He was yielded additional time for whatever purpose he wished.

Mr. WRIGHT. I merely want to state that even though the Housing Authority has the right to program, that nevertheless they have to go back to the War Production Board to get priorities the same as any other building agency has to.

Mr. WILSON. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am sure the gentleman will find that correct.

Mr. WILSON. My good friend from Pennsylvania is not correct.

Now I want to go over one other matter: Our distinguished chairman mentioned the fact that the Federal Public Housing Authority was obliged to go out and build houses because the Army and the Navy asked for them; the fact that the Army and Navy asked for them they were obliged to go out and build houses, as our distinguished chairman said, places the responsibility squarely on your shoulders and on mine. That responsibility comes right down to the United States House of Representatives to decide the question, are we going to make it a policy that when the Army or the Navy asks for anything they shall have it without question? Is that to be the policy of the House? It certainly has not been in the past.

I want to refer to the audit on June 11, 1943, of the chief auditor of the Federal Public Housing Authority, who was requested to furnish a statement last fall regarding the status of the cost-plus projects. He stated that he did not have such a list. He suggested that the supervisor of the project development might be able to furnish that list of the buildings. The supervisor stated that he did not have such a list and that the F. H. A. was compiling a list of projects that were not over 90 percent completed.

Now, the policy of this Federal Public Housing Authority, for which we are appropriating this money today, has departed and gone far astray from the policy set out by the Federal Housing Agency—the F. H. A.

Mr. Chairman, I have here the figures to show that projects are costing us 155 percent, for the temporary, demountable projects, of what permanent, good construction by the Maritime Commission and the Navy is costing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of call-

ing attention to page 111 of the hearings, beginning at the top of the page, to the statement by Mr. MacDonald, in which he said:

We made no distinction between the public and private.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] asked this question:

Mr. MacDonald, how long has that policy been in effect?

Mr. MACDONALD. As to rating, you mean?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. The equal treatment of public and private?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would say that that has been an established principle ever since last fall. Now, I cannot date it accurately, but there was at one time, as I mentioned, several schools of thought, and some which felt that the public housing reflected more conservation, and therefore should be given a higher rating, and others that private builders were developing the houses faster, and therefore making them available more satisfactorily, and that had certain supporters.

But the policy itself in the War Production Board has been since last fall to apply the same rating and apply the same material allowances to public and private.

That was in response to a question asked by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]. The War Production Board said the private housing was entitled to the same priorities as the public housing.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. That is an incorrect statement on the part of the War Production Board, because they have allotted and authorized to the National Housing Agency priorities.

Mr. LANHAM. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, in 5 minutes it is very difficult to attempt to portray to any great extent this whole problem of national war housing. I should like to limit my part of the discussion to a few factual points because we have time for little more than that. In the first place, the national-war-housing program calls for caring for 1,100,000 immigrant war workers who will be moving to places throughout the United States this next year where national-war industries are located. The program contemplates nothing more than caring for these migrant workers, for nothing else whatsoever. It seems to me that the housing of the war workers is as important as any other part of our national-war program. It is just as important to see that these men have decent conditions in which to live as it is to see that we make actual appropriations for the Army or the Navy. In fact, both the Army and the Navy have requested this appropriation. They stated that it is indispensable to the war production effort. It does seem to me in view of this fact to be a very important point.

I might point out in connection with the controversy that has been raised here

regarding public and private housing that this is not a matter of either public housing or private housing. I think it should be emphasized that in the housing program for next year this bill which we are debating today takes care of only 22 percent of the entire housing contemplated. The entire war-housing program is 78 percent private, only 22 percent public housing, and it is the public housing that we are discussing here today.

On page 6 and again on page 26 of the hearings these findings are broken down so that any individual in the House wishing to discover just how the money is being spent, whether it is for dormitories, for family units, for single dwelling units, and so forth, can get the facts.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not a fact that the gentleman was a member of a committee which went out to the coast to investigate the housing situation?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; I was on such a committee.

Mr. POULSON. Did the gentleman not find that in the localities where the greatest amount of defense work was being carried on there was an acute shortage of housing facilities?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; I thank my colleague from California. Our subcommittee not only visited places on the west coast but we were in Kansas City and many other places where war industries have been established, and saw at first hand the heavy housing program that confronted them with the great number of immigrant war workers. The Pacific coast is probably harder hit than any other section of the country, but the problem is by no means limited to the west coast. We find it on the Atlantic coast as well; we find it in the South, and we found it in the Midwestern States. It is a matter that cannot be considered on a sectional basis but must be considered on the basis of the entire country.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not a fact that a great deal of absenteeism is due to the long distances many of the war workers have to travel on account of housing?

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank my colleague again for raising that question for it was a point I was going to discuss in just a moment. We found out a great deal about the problem of absenteeism. Wherever our subcommittee raised the question it was pointed out that absenteeism was in a great many instances due to improper housing or to the fact that the workers had to travel such great distances. We found one instance in which workers were traveling back and forth daily a round-trip distance of 120 miles, using up crucial materials such as gasoline and tires in the trip each day. The whole problem of absenteeism, it seems to me, has been greatly accentuated by the lack of adequate housing facilities.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. In just a moment.

There is another feature I wish to touch upon briefly before my time ex-

pires, and that is the health problem facing these communities. We talked with a great many physicians in communities where the problem of congestion has been increased, and almost unanimously they are begging for more housing, saying it must be provided now, saying that if they do not get this housing there is increasing danger of an epidemic in those communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is it not true that the need for houses on the coast and the diversion of this critical material to these projects in the Middle West and Indiana where they are not needed will help to promote absenteeism? Because you are not getting the critical material that you need.

Mr. OUTLAND. In answer to my friend from Indiana, I may say that it seems to me that the first step to determine is a study of where these essential war workers are going to be located. Testimony before our committee shows it is being made by the War Manpower Commission after consultation with the Army and the Navy and the various other agencies. I am not competent to say just how much housing is needed. It seems to me that in California we have a terribly acute problem but I should say that if we are going to have a comprehensive construction plan it should be put into effect first in those places where the need is most critical; and that was emphasized by the chairman.

This housing is of a temporary nature only. Not one dollar that is being appropriated in this new bill is for permanent housing. It is for materials and labor necessary to construct these in congested areas and in no other place in America.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. In reference to the question that the gentleman from Indiana propounded of the gentleman from California, did it not develop in the hearings in San Francisco that the situation so far as building materials are concerned has eased up very materially within the last few months?

Mr. OUTLAND. I do not recall exactly in regard to that, but that is my general impression, yes.

In conclusion may I say that I hope very much that the House agrees to the passage of this extremely important war measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to acknowledge the fact that

the National Housing Agency is not perfect. We as Members of Congress are not perfect. Our activities here in Congress are criticized by our constituency and we in turn ask our constituency not to condemn or praise us because of one, two, or five votes. We ask to be allowed to submit our entire record for their consideration and that is what I hope, Mr. Chairman, we will do this afternoon as far as the housing situation is concerned. Let us look at the entire record as established by the present National Housing Agency under the administration of what I consider a sincere and hard-working organization.

I am making no plea for the National Housing Agency but I do say at this time that what is now known as the National Housing Agency is doing a very fine job according to the testimony presented to our committee and the report of a subcommittee of our committee which recently returned from an inspection trip of various projects. I congratulate my distinguished colleague from Indiana on the fine manner in which he has presented his arguments. I am not taking exception to those arguments except to the extent that you will note he did not inform the membership where he obtained the figures that he submitted for our consideration. There are hearings here on the desk and I want as many as possible of the Members to get a copy of the hearings and read them, and I am sure that you will then agree that this agency has shown a good and sufficient reason for the \$300,000,000 they are asking for.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is the gentleman questioning the source of the figures I gave?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am.

Mr. WILSON. I will tell the gentleman where I got every figure.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wish that the gentleman from Indiana had given them during various parts of his speech—but I would be glad to have that information at this time.

Mr. WILSON. I got them from Mr. Lee, of the National Housing Agency, and I have them in black and white. If you want to give me time, I can give the break-down completely. That is a nice thing that he did, furnish me that information which I requested. So far as the Kingsbury plant is concerned, I have that in black and white given me by Mr. Lee, of the National Housing Agency, and I will be glad to show you that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Again I refer you to the hearings and figures submitted by the heads of the various departments, and their figures speak for themselves. Now, my distinguished colleague mentioned the Kingsbury plant. I call your attention to the fact that the Kingsbury project was projected in 1941 and that project was not under the National Housing Agency. The present Administrator had that project handed to him.

Mr. WILSON. But they are building 1,500 houses today and only 242 of those opened up since March have been occupied.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I again refer the gentleman to the hearings of our committee, and they are here for everyone to see. The Kingsbury-Laporte ordinance plant project was projected in 1941, not under the National Housing Agency. I am making no plea for the housing agency of that time, although I do remember very distinctly that my distinguished friend from Indiana did go with the committee to these particular areas, I think in 1941, and insist on houses being put into his district, and possibly in these very areas that he is now objecting to.

I just want to go forward with my thought relative to the needs of this \$300,000,000. If you will take the hearings as before our committee, I desire to cite you a number of pages in the hearings. Mr. Blandford's justification for this request of \$300,000,000 you will find on pages 4 and 5. You will find the request of the Manpower Commission and their backing for this bill on pages 6 and 7. Relative to the vacancies that my distinguished friend from Indiana has brought up I refer you to the hearings where this statement was made, and if it is in error I assure my distinguished friend or anyone else who questions it that we will call the men before our committee and we will find out who is right. There is a 91 percent occupancy of all family units and 84 percent of all the housing units at this time.

The average of all with the single units included is 84 percent. You can readily understand how you will have a vacancy in the single occupancy units. Those men are called for the draft, they are called from one plant to the other. When the Manpower Commission appeared before our board, and the Secretary of the Navy sent his statement and that was the very thing he based his request on. We are getting in-migration more than we ever had before. This bill covers 1,100,000 units. The men have been working in these plants, 3, 4, and 5 months, living in a single room, and I call the attention of my friend from Detroit to that fact. I am sorry he was not before our committee when the Detroit people were there. The men are moving from the single units to other places where they can get houses so that they can live with their families. I also call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that this was originally a request for \$400,000,000. Your committee reduced it \$100,000,000 to \$300,000,000. I voted in the committee to reduce it to \$200,000,000 but after getting all the facts together and carefully analyzing the over-all picture I firmly believe that \$300,000,000 is needed.

In view of the fact that none of the present funds for war housing can be used to take care of fiscal 1944 in-migration, the size of this in-migration makes absolutely imperative the program of war housing construction to be covered by the proposed authorization. The reasons for the in-migration of 1,100,000 war workers during fiscal 1944, which produces this housing need, may be summarized as follows:

First. Development of new war plants in some selected areas;

Second. Vast expansion of employment in existing plants, due to increasing shifts, longer hours, and the development of full plant capacities—all to meet production schedules that are doubling or even trebling;

Third. Recruitment of replacements for men drawn into the armed services;

Fourth. Depletion of local labor supply by the draft;

Fifth. This need for the additional war housing program, based upon a fiscal 1944 in-migration of 1,100,000 war workers, has been emphasized by the following:

(a) A special request by the President, sent to the Congress on May 13, 1943.

(b) Reports of regular congressional committees, which have held hearings on the whole subject matter.

(c) Special reports of congressional investigatory committees, portraying war housing needs.

(d) Testimony of agencies of the Government responsible for war production, such as the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission.

(e) Independent field surveys and studies of the National Housing Agency, working with local industrial, building, labor, and community groups.

(f) Various labor organizations, Nation-wide and local.

(g) Various representatives of private enterprise, including the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Home Builders.

#### MINIMAL NATURE OF THE PENDING AUTHORIZATION

The pending authorization, as approved by the House committee, is for only \$300,000,000, as contrasted with the \$400,000,000 requested by the National Housing Agency to build the publicly financed portion of the war housing program needed to take care of 1,100,000 in-migrants during fiscal 1944. Besides, this whole request for public construction covers only a fraction of the total program. Specifically, it covers only 200,000 units—70,000 dormitories, 40,000 conversions of existing structures, and 90,000 temporary family units of new construction—out of a total program of 940,000 units required for the 1,100,000 war workers. The other 740,000 units are to be provided entirely by the use of existing private structures, by privately financed conversion of existing structures, and by privately financed new construction. Moreover, the publicly financed portion of the whole program, to which the pending authorization relates, is limited entirely to the temporary housing needs which private industry is unable to serve—such as temporary dormitories, or conversions of those existing structures which private owners cannot afford the risk of converting solely for the war period, or temporary family units in areas where the need after the war is not sufficiently certain to justify and stimulate private construction.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to say to the gentleman that I, the same as the gentleman and the rest of us here on this floor, agree that we are for war housing for war workers. The only thing is that I should like to see this program used as

supplementary to the program of the private builders. I want to see that the private builders are first allocated all of the available building material, that priorities are given to them. In my city of Detroit four of the largest builders in the city were idle all last year and could not build houses because they could not get material and could not get priorities.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The great problem with a lot of our private business is that they want to build a permanent house and they do not care to build a temporary house for the low-income group. I feel this is because they cannot be sure how long their property will be rented.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not true. The type of houses they are building now range in price from \$4,000 to \$5,000. They cannot build a house over \$6,000.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Do I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is in opposition to this bill, which relates to temporary houses for war workers?

Mr. SADOWSKI. No, I am not in opposition to this bill but I am in opposition to the program of national housing which takes away critical building materials from private builders and gives them to national building agencies.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am in complete accord that private contractors should be given same consideration as public, but I believe my distinguished chairman read from the record—and if I am wrong, we will be glad to bring the man before our committee—that private contractors and public contractors were on exactly the same priority. If I am in error I will be willing to stand corrected.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I understand the housing project at Burns City, Ind., in my district, is made up of temporary houses and that the people down there claim the houses are not fit to live in. If there are only 23 houses occupied out of 600 down there, there is something wrong. If they are going to build these temporary houses any place else, they are not fit to live in. They blow over; they are made of cardboard and wood, and they have cracks in them. I have visited the place myself. The people say they will not live in them.

Mr. MCGREGOR. May I read from the hearings. Mr. Blandford made this statement, and if this is in error, we will call him in. This is regarding Burns City:

The project includes 600 units, of which 374 units are now available for occupancy. Some of these became available in April, others this last month, and the balance are still under construction. Twenty-two units are leased, 60 applications for dwellings are now being processed, and other applications are being received.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it true they are proceeding with this appropriation on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, or is it on a contract basis?

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is absolutely untrue for any statement to be made that a large portion of this project is carried on under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. I am not going to disagree or agree with my distinguished friend from Indiana on the past activities of Housing Administration, but I will say to this House that there will be less than 10 percent and maybe less than 5 percent of this cost on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. We do have some places where because of the immediate labor being necessary and completion being demanded by a certain date, the contractors will not bid, but it is not really on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. There is a contract established and they cannot exceed a certain amount.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I was wondering what the status of this program is. Is it about completed, or do you expect to ask for more funds later?

Mr. MCGREGOR. In my candid opinion, and in reading the hearings of the other body in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday—this will probably be the last housing bill, because we have carefully gone into this whole situation and we feel that we have taken care of the permanent structures and this will take care of the temporary. Now we are doing this because of the request of the War Production Board, the Manpower Commission, and the Army and the Navy. However, I assure my colleague from Ohio that conditions change from day to day—but to my mind this is the end as the picture looks at this time. Again I say—private contractors will not build these temporary houses, because they have no assurance of how long they are going to be occupied. They say it is a loss of money.

I honestly and candidly believe—and I believe my record will justify my statement that I am opposed to any unnecessary expenses—that this bill is necessary in order to keep our workers from going from one place to another, because they just will not stay in localities that do not have adequate housing facilities for themselves and their families—and decent living quarters are necessary for them to give their best efforts to the war program.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I have yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. I thank you. I have here a copy of a report submitted yesterday by the investigator for the Truman committee to the committee. It is not the committee's report. It is his report,

submitted to the Truman committee. I read:

Investigations disclose that there are at least 150 cost plus housing deals in full swing at present, and the method of handling them is only one of the many old practices still going on.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. Let me make this statement to the gentleman, however. We have held hearings for weeks and weeks, and we never had anyone appear before our committee and make any such statement. The gentleman is a member of our committee. If he had this information it was his duty as a legislator, representing the district that he so ably represents, to submit that information to the committee so that we could call in those men, instead of waiting until the last minute, when the bill is up for consideration, and give us some information that we should have had before.

Mr. WILSON. I made it clear earlier in the day why you were not given that information.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Now, attention has been called to 10 or 15 instances where the National Housing Agency has been in error. Multiply that by 10 and you have 100. That makes 100 errors out of around 3,031,952 units constructed. If the opposition cannot bring up more than 100 places that are bad, our batting average is pretty good. That is far less than 1-percent error.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Now private capital is so willing and able and anxious to come in and build these houses. Is it not true that at the time these projects were instituted private capital was not ready, and the Government had to do it?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is true.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not true of our city of Detroit.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. It applies to every city, including Detroit.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I am thinking of Vallejo, Calif., where last fall over two-thirds of the workers traveled from 10 to 40 miles back and forth to work.

Mr. MCGREGOR. This money will be used to move workers closer to the plant in order to save our automobile and rubber supply. There is no question that there have been errors made, but all we ask is to take the total of the work, the average good and bad of the work, and I feel certain you will agree with this committee's report and pass this bill authorizing \$300,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is desired to use a few minutes for the disposition of a

conference report, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the defense housing bill (H. R. 2975) and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 278), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the remainder of the week ending July 3, 1943, it shall be in order to consider conference reports the same day reported to the House, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 92.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1943 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated December 3, 1942."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 98 and 99.

M. C. TARVER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
ELMER E. WENE,  
W. P. LAMBERTSON,  
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
J. H. BANKHEAD,  
E. D. SMITH,  
GERALD P. NYE,  
CHAS. L. McNARY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

##### STATEMENT

##### (Third conference report)

The managers on the part of the House at the third conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment No. 88, incentive payments: Strikes out the House provision prohibiting incentive payments. The House recedes with an amendment, restoring the matter stricken by the Senate, amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1943 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated December 3, 1942."

It is the purpose of the conferees that the language substituted for the House language stricken by the Senate amendment No. 88 shall make possible compliances by the Department of Agriculture with every commitment made in the announcement of the 1943 agricultural adjustment program as announced on December 3, 1942, with subsequent modifications, except that the payments outlined in House Document No. 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, shall not be made and future commitments shall be restricted as provided in the House language, stricken by Senate amendment No. 92, from which the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 92: Strikes out the House language limiting the program to soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, and inserts language permitting a program of broader scope, giving more emphasis to the production of food by including practices not necessarily soil-building. The Senate recedes.

##### In disagreement

The conferees have not agreed with respect to amendments Nos. 98 and 99, relating to Federal crop insurance. The House appropriates \$3,500,000 for the liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, providing for the payment of losses on the current year's crop, and prohibiting the writing of any further insurance on subsequent crops. The Senate appropriates \$7,818,748 and strikes out the House language providing for the liquidation of the corporation.

M. C. TARVER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
ELMER E. WENE,  
W. P. LAMBERTSON,  
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 2481, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents the conclusion of agreement on all items in dispute in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, with the exception of two amendments, No. 98 and No. 99, dealing with the subject of Federal crop insurance.

It is the purpose of the managers on the part of the House to move, after the conference report has been considered, to further insist upon disagreement with the two Senate amendments in question, and we have reason to believe that the Senate will recede from its insistence upon those amendments, in which case, if this conference report is adopted, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the next fiscal year will have been completed.

The conference report which you are now considering deals only with two amendments, Senate amendment No. 88 and Senate amendment No. 92. Amendment No. 88 is an amendment striking language which barred the use of any of the \$400,000,000 provided for soil conservation and crop adjustment payments in the payment of incentives. There was not a very general agreement as to just what constitutes incentive payments. We have had that subject matter under discussion on several occasions during recent days and on yesterday, as you will recall, a vote was had in the House with regard to the inclusion of some substitute language in connection with the Senate amendment, which would have made clear that it was not the purpose of the Congress to prohibit the carrying out of the farm program as it was projected last December by the Department of Agriculture, and carrying out all commitments made by the Department under authority of law to the farmers of the country.

The House on yesterday, by a majority of 10, declined to approve the language that was suggested in the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]. We have agreed in this conference report upon substitute language which you have heard read, but which I shall read again to you in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to what the language provides, and in that connection I call your attention particularly to the language of the statement of the managers on the part of the House explaining the meaning of this language as it is understood by the House and the Senate conferees.

For the language stricken by Senate amendment No. 88 it is proposed to insert this substitute proviso:

*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall

be used for any incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payments of acreage allotments and commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended and as enumerated and set forth in the 1943 agricultural conservation program bulletin dated December 3, 1942.

It is the purpose of this language, as it was agreed to by the House and the Senate conferees, to provide, as stated in the statement of the managers, that commitments made by the Government through the Department of Agriculture to farmers of the country in connection with the farm program for the present crop year 1943 shall be carried out; that the promises of the Government in this respect shall be made good; and it is the further purpose that the payments which were projected in House Document 101, and which have been referred to as incentive payments, shall not be made, and it is not the purpose to have them made.

Insofar as this bill is concerned, no money was included in the bill for the purpose of making any of those payments, but the language of the amendment which is here recommended to the House is intended to prohibit the possibility of those particular payments being made from the \$400,000,000 appropriation.

The Senate amendment No. 92 struck the language inserted in the House bill which would have limited next year's program to soil conservation and water conservation payments, and which would have limited the amount of next year's program to \$300,000,000.

In the conference report the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 92, and therefore the language stricken by the amendment will remain in the bill if this report is approved and if the bill, as it will be after the approval of the report, is finally enacted into law. This simply means that we are providing for the discharge of all obligations of the Government in the current program and at the same time we are limiting next year's program to soil conservation and water conservation purposes to the amount of \$300,000,000. Also that the farmers of the country will have notice before they begin their next year's crop operations as to just what these commitments are and will not incur expenditures, as they have done this year, because of other types of payments which have this year been promised to them and which cannot be promised them next year under the language of this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the language of the conferees, as it is now proposed, contemplate about the same result or would result in about the same thing as would have resulted from the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina yesterday?

Mr. TARVER. It is my opinion that it would bring about exactly the same result.

Mr. MURDOCK. And by keeping faith with farmers, it would deal justly, insofar as payment to farmers who have

acted upon the recommendations of the Government?

Mr. TARVER. It protects their rights under commitments heretofore made by the Department of Agriculture and makes a limitation effective as to future commitments.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRANGER. What has been cut out of the 1944 program then?

Mr. TARVER. The crop acreage or production adjustment payments are cut out; the payments which have heretofore been made and will be made for the present crop year on cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and peanuts will not be made on those crops for the 1944 crop year if the language of the bill as recommended in the conference report in connection with the items to which I have directed attention, is approved by the Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly what payments could be made under the terms of the bill with regard to 1944?

Mr. TARVER. Any soil or water conservation payments, payments to farmers for terracing their land, for planting legumes, or certain types of fertilization, for planting trees or planting permanent pastures. There are numerous types of soil conservation and water conservation practices that can be paid for under the limitations outlined in this year's bill if this report is approved.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that, but if the language presently proposed were adopted would it be possible as to 1944 to make any payments at all which would be of an incentive character on war crops?

Mr. TARVER. After 1944?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; in 1944.

Mr. TARVER. It will not be possible to make any payments on 1944 crops except soil conservation and water conservation payments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House left the conferees in a rather difficult position on one amendment, namely, amendment No. 88. The confusion and the difficulty arises from the facts first that the House by a record vote earlier in the week boosted the amount in the bill for soil conservation and domestic allotment purposes from \$300,000,000 to \$400,000,000; secondly, the House by a record vote expunged the House language and substituted the Senate language so that the money could be expended for other than soil compliance purposes in order to carry out what the House evidently felt were the moral commitments of the Department of Agriculture to the farmers. In the light of that action some administrative difficulty would manifestly arise over

the fact that there was still language which the House retained by record vote which forbade the payment of so-called incentive payments; so our responsibility was to modify that language somewhat to bring it in line with the rest of the bill as approved by the House by a record vote.

In pursuance of the responsibility we therefore contrived the language the gentleman from Georgia read a moment ago, namely, that we did preserve the interdiction against incentive payments, but we provided an exception and said that except that the money in addition to that for soil compliance purposes and for water conservation practices could be used for agricultural allotment commitments, namely, the so-called commitments that were made in the program when it was announced in December 1942 by the Department of Agriculture. We implement that in the bill by language in the report which makes it reasonably clear they can go ahead and carry out their commitments including soil conservation and soil compliance practices, but we made it quite clear to the Department that they cannot commit the country, they cannot commit the Congress, they cannot commit the Federal Treasury to a commitment program in 1944. That is very definite. These are the two commitments that are contained in the report and the conferees were quite unanimous on that part of the report.

I might say that the only items in disagreement now are those relating to so-called crop insurance that will be reported in disagreement directly and I hope to say a word or two more about it. It has been represented to the House and it is a fact that the House conferees had unanimously and consistently opposed on every occasion the continuation of the so-called Crop Insurance Corporation. We have provided for its liquidation. It ought to be liquidated, and if necessary we should go on record once more in an overwhelming way as an admonition to the Senate as to how we feel about the continuation of that insurance program. That item will come up directly.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments in disagreement relating to crop insurance be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the two amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 98: On page 76, line 17, strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$7,818,748."

Amendment No. 99: On page 76, line 21, strike out the proviso beginning in line 21

after the word "newspapers" down to and including line 2 on page 77.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 and 99.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. TARVER. I yield for the purpose of the gentleman's offering the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99, and concur in the same.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that some of the issues in this particular appropriation bill are getting a little threadbare since we have been back here three or four times and will probably have to come back once more. The agricultural appropriation bill for 1944 will now be concluded with the exception of this one item involving continuation of the Crop Insurance Corporation.

I merely recapitulate the argument that has been made heretofore. We reported the bill with a provision that this corporation ought to be liquidated because its losses, that is, the excess of the indemnities over premiums, plus expenses, both put together, amounted to the sum of about \$41,000,000 in 4 years. We have concluded unanimously in the subcommittee that the experiment has gone far enough, so we provide sufficient funds to take care of the commitments that have been made and then liquidate the Corporation. The Senate, on the other hand, struck out this language and wants to continue this insurance corporation.

The gentleman from North Carolina now offers a preferential motion to the effect that we recede and concur in the Senate amendment which means to embrace the Senate position and to continue the operation of the Corporation.

I think I can add one new item to the general argument and that is this: One of the Members of the Senate appeared before us in conference this morning with a very brief statement in the nature of a summarization as to what could be done, according to the officials of the insurance corporation. Frankly, I was amazed, in view of the fact they had asked for more than \$7,500,000 to carry on this work that they now say they can carry on with \$3,000,000. I do not know when or how or by what magic they have suddenly changed their notion as to the amount of money that is neces-

sary. They thought that perhaps that might induce the House conferees to change their position.

Our position is not predicated upon the amount of administrative expense. It is predicated on the fact that this is a losing operation, that it has been unsuccessful after 4 years of trial on wheat and 1 year on cotton, that there is danger that other commodities will be added and the losses to the Treasury will be greater year after year. We concluded that the wise, sensible and common sense thing to do is to liquidate it now. That is the action we propose and I suggest that the preferential motion be voted down by a great and smacking majority.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Exclusive of administrative cost, what has the cotton crop insurance program cost the taxpayers of America today?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the figure before me, but the loss on cotton for a single year, including the administrative expense, was more than \$1,300,000 and on wheat the loss was over \$40,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman said he did not complain about the administrative cost because the law provided that the Government should defray that expense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, the gentleman must get me right. I said that the proposal that was made to us this morning that they could get along on \$3,000,000 of administrative cost does not represent the whole story. Our contention is that taking it all in all it is an unsuccessful operation, it has had its experimental period, the stamp of failure must be put upon it, so it should be liquidated now.

Mr. COOLEY. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: He said it lost \$40,000,000 on the wheat program, but that figure includes the administrative cost.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will tell the gentleman what the figure is. The loss of indemnities paid to farmers over premiums collected from the farmers for 4 years was \$17,000,000, the administrative cost \$24,000,000, the aggregate is \$41,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is a correct statement of the figures. Did the gentleman support this program initially when it first came before the House?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In your conference with Members from the South, and especially the gentleman who has just spoken, did you ever learn how long the industrial North tax-paying States are going to continue to support them and keep their farmers on a hand-out?

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield to answer that question? I will be glad to compare the statistics of the State of North Carolina with the statistics of Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be glad to compare the record of the State of Michigan and what it has paid out in taxes and the amount it has received in benefits. You have been on our pay roll for too long.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what you think.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman know of any risk incurred in business that is not covered by insurance, aside from agricultural risks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I do not. On the other hand, I do not know of a single insurance venture covering any field of human activity where the administrative expense is taken out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I can cite an insurance program established at Governmental expense. Does the gentleman feel there are now insurance companies, private insurance companies, operating to take care of farm risks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that kind of a risk because they cannot afford to take the loss and I do not believe the taxpayers of the United States can afford to take it either.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is said that Lloyds will insure anything. Must it be said America cannot do as well? Of course it takes time and numbers to establish insurance. If this crop insurance is now voted out does the gentleman believe that within the next 100 years it will ever be brought up again after this so-called experiment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no idea. So far as the private companies are concerned, they tried it. Every one that went into this venture failed and none have tried it since that time. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to use the largesse of the Federal Government in season and out for a losing venture? If that is the case we might as well insure every human endeavor of which the mind is capable and wash the loss through the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. When we knock out the provision today, we are saying to the American farmer, "You have no protection and can have no protection under any insurance scheme." That is not very encouraging to future farmers.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Have we not had fairly good crops in this country during the last 4 years?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. If we have lost \$41,000,000 in 4 years when the crops are good, what would happen in a bad year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If this thing was such a lure why is it that only 1 out of 3 wheat farmers have taken the insurance and 1 out of 10 cotton farmers? We got the figures last year as applied to different counties in Texas

and it was amazing to see how many farmers would insure for 1 year then drop out for the next 2 years because they could not be lured into the scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the preferential motion will be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make this final effort to save the crop-insurance program. It may be a futile effort. It is very significant when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois attempts to liquidate a corporation which he has bitterly opposed from the very beginning. No real friend of the crop-insurance program wants to liquidate it at the present time. Certainly the gentleman from Michigan favors its liquidation, but he has never been a friend of all risk crop insurance.

It was an experiment. I knew it was an experiment, you knew it was an experiment, and the gentleman from Illinois knew it was an experiment. The cotton program has operated 1 year. It is true we lost \$1,000,000, but the original bill authorized an appropriation of \$100,000,000.

Why should we abandon it? If it is abandoned at the present time it probably never will be undertaken again. Is it not somewhat unreasonable to expect any administrator to set up a Nationwide corporation, operating in every wheat-growing and cotton-growing county in America, and set it up on an actuarially sound basis in the brief space of 2 or 3 years? As the participation in this program grows the premiums will decrease. It is hoped that after a while, maybe 2 or 3 more years, it can be made actuarially sound and cheap enough to attract the farmers into the program.

One word about the comment of the gentleman from Michigan. I want it definitely understood now that I am not asking the gentleman from Michigan or anyone in this Congress to pension the State of North Carolina. I think the tax-paying record of that great commonwealth will compare very favorably with the record of the State of Michigan. My recollection is that North Carolina in paying revenue into the Federal Treasury is probably next to the State of New York and even ahead of the State of Michigan.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Is it not true that every time we buy an automobile or a Frigidaire Michigan gets the credit for the tax we pay?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and that is the reason the gentleman from Michigan can be so satisfied about the revenue situation in Michigan.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not true that every time we buy a package of cigarettes we pay a tax to North Carolina?

Mr. COOLEY. What has that to do with crop insurance? The proposition here is whether we are going to do the foolish thing of having gone on record as in favor of this program just 12 months ago and now going down the hill again and wrecking the program, because the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois and some others do not think it has been successful. Of course, it has not been successful. Of course, it is not making money. But, I repeat, this money is not lost when it is paid out in benefits to the farmers. It goes into the pockets of distressed farmers who have lost more than 75 percent of their crops because of some disaster over which they have had no control.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we wanted to start out to prove that even the well-established life insurance is fallacious and without sound economic foundation, we could do it by taking any 10 Members of this House and rigging up a scheme on a 3-year basis and prove that it cannot be done. It takes time and numbers to put any insurance on a mathematical basis.

Mr. COOLEY. I doubt very much that any corporation would be able to demonstrate the soundness of an insurance program in 3 years.

Some mention has been made of the activities of private corporations in the field of all-risk crop insurance. They have undertaken it, and they have failed; there is no question about it. They failed because of various and sundry reasons. They did not have the necessary data, they did not have the necessary funds, and they did not have the necessary interest in the farmers they sought to insure. We have the information and the data, we have the necessary funds, and certainly we have an interest in our farmers. I hope very much that the program may be continued.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 2935, the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina told about the private companies which attempted to insure crops failing. That was because they were conducted on a businesslike basis and the business was no good. They

did not have back of them the United States Treasury, as you want to put the United States Treasury back of this crop insurance program. I have known that one Governor of a Carolina State said to the Governor of another of the Carolinas that it was a long time between drinks, but the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] does not want any time at all between hand-outs for the cotton planters, not a minute.

We are down to the time when we need every dollar we can get, every dollar we can get to carry on the war, not experiments, as the gentleman concedes this crop insurance to be.

I have seldom heard a more bitter Republican speech from the Democratic side than that made this morning by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. He told how the Army and the Navy, that we are all backing, have been wasting our money. He said they were not only wasting it but, if I understood him correctly, he said they were guilty of criminal negligence in the spending, and he pointed out just how it had been wasted.

Here is another Government agency and they want us to give them more money to continue this New Deal experiment, which, it is admitted, has cost us forty-one million and over. When are you going to get around to quit trying to get something for nothing from the Federal Government, raiding the Federal Treasury, and get down and put all of our efforts behind the war effort?

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman propounding that question to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman just wants another sugar daddy for this cotton-crop insurance, and the armed forces need all the money we can raise.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to appear stubborn regarding this item, but I sincerely believe that this is a worth-while program and one which the Congress should provide for the producers of this Nation—those who must feed us.

It is rather singular that members of the Committee on Agriculture who set up this program a few years ago must come here and fight for its life as against what amounts to a legislative enactment by the Appropriations Committee. I understand there was a time when legislative committees were permitted to make their own appropriations, but I wonder if it is not an evil of equal degree that the Appropriations Committee is permitted to legislate, to discontinue a program set up by the Congress, legislatively, through a determined effort on the part of some who have from the beginning never consented to its organization.

I wish it were possible for you to agree to give us another year or two to try to demonstrate the usefulness of this program. It is not fair to say that only 10 percent of the cotton farmers are interested. Many more are interested. The program was started late last year

and was put in the hands of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, many of whom were not in favor of it, did not endorse it and did not try to get the farmers to come into the program. I think I can confidently tell you that if the cotton program is not operating in a manner entirely satisfactory to the overwhelming majority of this Congress after 3 years, all of us will join in its dissolution. I wish so much that you could permit this item of \$7,000,000 to remain in the bill, as fixed by the Senate, in order that this program may go forward.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of developing one further point?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. It is a fact that we authorized this corporation to enter into 3-year contracts, which have been in existence only 1 year.

Mr. PACE. And which have effected considerable saving and will effect considerable saving in the future. I do not know, but I am told that the last vote in the Senate was 49 to 10 to maintain its position. I may say that we might dispose of this bill more quickly by concurring in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I do this for the purpose of replying to the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The language included in the bill as it passed the House provides for the carrying out of any Government obligations under existing contracts. As far as the 3-year contract is concerned, every one of those 3-year contracts had written into the face of it a statement that it is contingent upon the making of appropriations by Congress to carry out the Government's obligations. Each of those contracts is legally terminable after the expiration of 1 year. The Government's liabilities do not extend beyond 1 year except by its consent.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not reasonable to suppose that the contracting parties assumed that when a 3-year contract was executed the Government would stay in business for 3 years?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no, because the provision is placed in the contract itself providing for the termination of the contract.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY].

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the measure of man's progress in the long and difficult march toward civilization is his ability to eliminate preventable hazards and to alleviate the results of those hazards which he is yet unable to master. That is what civilization means. Insurance means that we accept collective responsibility to help alleviate the hazards that happen to some of us. Insurance means that we bear collectively those burdens which are often disastrous when borne personally.

As far as I know, there is not a single one of my constituents who will benefit from this crop-insurance program; but

I am interested in Americans; in farmers. I represent a city constituency. However, I am interested in doing everything that can be done to give fair treatment and justice to the men who plant and harvest our crops. Farming is a hazardous occupation. If we can develop means and methods by experimentation, as we are doing, to eliminate those hazards or to alleviate the results of those hazards, I think we will be very, very wise to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 62, noes 100.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 135, nays 223, answering "present" 1, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—135

Abernethy	Gregory	Murdock
Allen, La.	Hagen	Murphy
Beckworth	Hare	Murray, Tenn.
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Newsome
Boren	Hart	Norrell
Boykin	Hays	O'Connor
Brooks	Hendricks	O'Konski
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Outland
Bryson	Hoch	Pace
Bulwinkle	Hoeven	Patman
Burdick	Holmes, Wash.	Patton
Burgin	Hope	Peterson, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Horan	Peterson, Ga.
Carlson, Kans.	Hull	Pittenger
Chapman	Jackson	Poage
Coffee	Jarman	Price
Colmer	Johnson	Priest
Cooley	Luther A.	Ramspeck
Cooper	Johnson	Rankin
Courtney	Lyndon B.	Rees, Kans.
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Cravens	Kee	Rivers
Creal	Kefauver	Robinson, Utah
Crosser	Kelley	Rogers, Calif.
Cunningham	Kerr	Sadowski
Curtis	Kirwan	Sikes
Davis	LaFollette	Smith, W. Va.
Dawson	Larade	Sparkman
Dillweg	Lemke	Spence
Domengaoux	McCord	Starnes, Ala.
Dworshak	McGehee	Steagall
Eberhart	McKenzie	Stefan
Feighan	McMillan	Stewart
Fernandez	McMurray	Stockman
Flannagan	Maas	Vincent, Ky.
Fogarty	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Folger	Mahon	Weaver
Fulbright	Manasco	Welch, Ga.
Gale	Mansfield,	White
Gathings	Mont.	Whitten
Gibson	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Gilchrist	Martin, Iowa	Winstead
Gordon	Miller, Nebr.	Winter
Gore	Mills	Worley
Granger	Monroney	Wright
Grant, Ala.	Mundt	Zimmerman

NAYS—223

Andersen,	Andrews	Baldwin, Md.
H. Carl	Angell	Barrett
Anderson, Calif.	Arends	Barry
Andersen,	Arnold	Bates, Ky.
August H.	Auchincloss	Bates, Mass.

Beall	Gross	Pfeiffer
Bell	Gwynne	Philbin
Bender	Hale	Ploesser
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Poulson
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Powers
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Rabaut
Blackney	Harris, Va.	Ramey
Bland	Heffernan	Randolph
Bloom	Heidinger	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Hill	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Robertson
Buffett	Hoffman	Rockwell
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Mass.	Rodgers, Pa.
Burchill, N. Y.	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Busbey	Jeffrey	Rohrbough
Butler	Jenkins	Rolph
Camp	Jennings	Rowe
Canfield	Jensen	Sabath
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson,	Sasser
Carson, Ohio	Anton J.	Satterfield
Carter	Johnson,	Sauthoff
Celler	Calvin D.	Schiffner
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Schuetz
Chilperfield	Johnson,	Schwabe
Church	J. Leroy	Scott
Clason	Jones	Short
Clevenger	Jonkman	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Slaughter
Compton	Kearney	Smith, Maine
Costello	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Curley	Kinzer	Smith, Wis.
D'Alessandro	Klein	Springer
Day	Knutson	Stanley
Delaney	Kunkel	Stevenson
Dewey	Lambertson	Sullivan
Dickstein	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Dies	Lane	Summers, Tex.
Dirksen	Lanham	Sundstrom
Disney	LeCompte	Talbot
Ditter	LeFevre	Talle
Dondero	Lewis	Tarver
Douglas	Ludlow	Taylor
Drewry	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Ellis	McCowan	Thomason
Ellison, Md.	McGranery	Tibbott
Ellsworth	McGregor	Towe
Elmer	McLean	TROUTMAN
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Vorys, Ohio
Engel	Madden	Vursell
Fellows	Maloney	Walters
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Ward
Fish	Mason	Wasielewski
Fisher	May	Weichel, Ohio
Forand	Morrow	Weiss
Gamble	Michener	Welch
Gavagan	Miller, Conn.	Wene
Gavin	Miller, Mo.	West
Gearhart	Miller, Pa.	Whittington
Gerlach	Monkiewicz	Wigglesworth
Gifford	Mott	Willie
Gillette	Mruk	Wilson
Gillie	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Goodwin	Myers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Graham	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff, Mich.
Griffiths	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodrum, Va.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Case

NOT VOTING—72

Allen, Ill.	Green	Norton
Anderson,	Hall,	O'Hara
N. Mex.	Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall,	O'Neal
Barden	Leonard W.	O'Toole
Bradley, Mich.	Harless, Ariz.	Phillips
Buckley	Hartley	Plumley
Byrne	Hébert	Pracht
Capozzoli	Hollifield	Robison, Ky.
Clark	Izac	Rowan
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Russell
Culkin	Keefe	Scanlon
Cullen	Kennedy	Shafer
Dingell	Kilburn	Sheppard
Doughton	King	Sheridan
Durham	Kleberg	Snyder
Eaton	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Fay	Lesinski	Stearns, N. H.
Fitzpatrick	Luce	Taber
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Tolan
Fulmer	Merritt	Treadway
Furlong	Morrison, La.	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Morrison, N. C.	Vinson, Ga.
Gorski	Nichols	Wadsworth
Gossett	Norman	Wheat

So the motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Case for, with Mr. Treadway against.  
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.  
Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Eaton against.  
Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Shafer against.  
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.  
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Taber.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gallagher.  
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Allen of Illinois.  
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Keefe.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hartley.  
Mr. Cappelzoli with Mr. Pracht.  
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.  
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Wheat.  
Mr. Fay with Mr. Plumley.  
Mr. King with Mr. O'Hara.  
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Phillips.  
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.  
Mr. Kennedy with Mrs. Luce.  
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wadsworth.  
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
Mr. Izac with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.  
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Culkin.  
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Van Zandt.  
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Norman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I voted yea; I withdraw my vote and vote nay.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as voting "yea." I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Treadway, and I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion of Mr. TARVER to further insist was then agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TARVER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the amendments in disagreement were disposed of, was laid on the table.

#### INCREASING THE AMOUNT AUTHORIZED BY DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) to increase by \$300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2975) increasing the amount authorized for defense housing, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, the bill (H. R. 2975) has for its purpose the increasing by \$300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing.

I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the subcommittee for about 5

weeks on the west coast and that committee conducted hearings in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, in which much of the housing that has been built up to the present time is located.

My observation was, as we went about those three States, that a great need, not only for the housing that had already been built, but for additional housing, was present. I might say that in each community in which we held hearings, different ones expressed themselves that where local funds were available they should be permitted to build houses, and that was in agreement with the members of the committee. But we found so many places where thousands of houses were needed where no one wanted to spend their own money to build houses that perhaps after the war would be taken down. In other words, the families who are moving from place to place today will not be in those areas after the close of the war.

We were in areas where many more houses were needed in the interest of the war effort. In some localities we were told by defense plants that they could use 25,000 to 50,000 additional workers. For instance, in the city of Portland, Oreg.—

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman from California state the conditions that he found and explain the situation that he found in my area, the Portland area, where we have hundreds of workers who have gone there; in other words, tell us what the situation with respect to housing is.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will state to the gentleman from Oregon we found in his congressional district and in the Portland area that there were hundreds of thousands of workers who had come to that area to work in the shipyards or in the airplane manufacturing plants, and on account of the lack of housing facilities had returned to eastern States. Further, we found in that area, in one housing unit alone just lacking a few houses of being a 10,000 unit, and in that particular area the need for more housing was very apparent for the simple reason of the construction of ships and the repairs to airplanes in that area.

We also found that in Bremerton, Wash., ships that had been damaged at Pearl Harbor had been lying at dock for 3 or 4 months and the need for repair was great. We were told by the Navy Department that they could use 25,000 to 50,000 additional workers and that it was very important that they have further housing, additional to the emergency housing that had been provided; that it was needed to take care of the increased number of workers they were prepared to place in those shipyards to repair ships damaged in the present war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I guess this would be a good time to make a confession. It is that at the time I was appointed a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I had considerable resentment toward the Federal buildings program. I had that resentment because of my own personal experiences as a construction superintendent on various Government war projects.

I was superintendent of construction on a large industrial war plant in the city of St. Louis. I had charge of 5 buildings there and on 1 building the Government changed the plans 93 times. On another war plant I had occasion to make an excavation 4 times as large as the Chamber in which we are now assembled, drive pilings on every 30-inch center, put in footings, reinforced steel, place the concrete, and set bolts for the erection of steel; then have someone from Washington decide that they were going to put in only 3 open-hearth furnaces instead of 4 that had been planned, and I had to fill up a place the area of this Chamber.

I have had forms for concrete built in areas the size of a quarter of a city block, reinforcing steel in place, runways down, electric conduit in place, everything ready to pour the concrete—and somebody higher up comes along and tells me they have changed their minds, and they are going to put in a wood-block flooring instead of concrete, and then it was a matter of tearing the whole thing out and lowering it 2½ inches because someone had made an error.

I have had to go out, like a thief in the night, and steal a mile of railroad track in order to complete a Government defense project because I could get no priorities through. Because of these facts I had resentment; but now that I have had an opportunity to study a different phase of Government construction, the Public Housing Administration, and serving as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, that resentment has disappeared, because that organization has been willing to sit down with me and discuss the problems affecting my Nation and my country and to give me the benefit of the experience that they have had and benefited by, and which, added to the information which I have sought and obtained, has convinced me that this program is absolutely necessary.

We have heard the statement made that some of the members of the Public Housing Administration receive a salary of \$3,800. In this war effort we must have men and we must pay for them—this is war. I have paid carpenters \$150 a week. I paid a man running a bulldozer as much as \$225 a week at a war plant. I have seen bricklayers receive from \$150 to \$160 a week. I have paid \$80 a week for ordinary labor. Contrast that with the charge that only 18 percent of the men who direct this program receive more than \$3,800 a year and it is not surprising that some mistakes have been made. We cannot condemn them too much considering the load they carry. I do not doubt that mistakes will

be made in the enormous program which is now in effect for the construction of housing near shipbuilding yards, projects built to accommodate men who are repairing fighting ships, men who are working in ordnance plants and other war industries which no one knew would grow up in that vicinity or when they will be abandoned. In view of these facts it is absolutely necessary.

It is part of our war program. We must furnish for these ordnance plants a place for the workers to live and we must pay for it. I face this matter with an unbiased mind. Being a private contractor before I came to Congress, and being desirous of being more helpful in the war effort, I took a job as superintendent of construction on war plants. As a contractor, I realize the problem that is going to face us, but as a contractor I would not want to go out and invest money in a construction job building houses which I knew were temporary and on which the chances were I would not be able to get a return on the investment. On matters of this kind it is a Federal problem.

We have been assured by the Housing Authority that it will permit private builders in any section in the Nation to come in and assume any portion of the building they can take on, and we have been assured there will be cooperation with the local authorities, they will consult with the real estate boards, the Chambers of Commerce, and the various agencies in determining how many conversions can be made before new construction is brought in. I believe in a program of that kind, and I believe it can be worked out as economically as any we can formulate.

Mistakes have been made, I know that, but I believe the new administration which is now directing the policies of that agency will do a good job, and, you know, we cut a hundred million dollars from their appropriation in committee. I believe the new agency can justify the money it now requests and that the program as formulated and presented to this House can easily be justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Building and Grounds Committee, as most of you know, for a number of years. When this housing program first started I approached the whole subject with a good deal of skepticism because I did not want a lot of houses built in cities all over the United States that would be eyesores or that would be empty after this war is over. Naturally, approaching it from the viewpoint of skepticism, I gave it a little bit more study than I otherwise would have done. I soon became convinced, however, that if we are going to win this war we are going to have to have houses for the people who are doing the work in our war plants.

I was astounded at the vast number of people who have had to move their homes. For instance, in my own city of Kansas City, we have had during the last

12 months a net increase of over 50,000 people. Twenty-five thousand people have moved out of the town, the boys have gone into the service and for other reasons these 25,000 moved out. But over 70,000 have moved in. The result has been that we have had somewhat painful adjustments there. We have a plant about 15 miles from Kansas City. Great numbers of men drive back and forth, taking 2 or 3 hours a day to go to and from their work. As long as they can do that, I have no complaint, if they can get back and forth and do the necessary work to win this war. But there are many communities all over the United States where there are not yet sufficient houses within driving distance to properly man the war plants. I am urging every one of you gentlemen today as patriotic American citizens to give us the necessary funds to see to it that the required number of houses are built to take care of the workers who are going to have to make the machines and the munitions we need to win this war.

I have had the feeling this program has been handled better than some of the programs that we witnessed. I have gone to various places in the United States and I find that usually we do not have any more houses than we need. It is true that in some rare instances we hear of cases where too many houses were built. If you dig deep enough though, you will usually find there is a good reason for that. For instance, the military authorities themselves have changed their plans. I know of one place where they have vacant houses, and I was astounded that they would have vacant houses there, but I found that was a plant making munitions. Now, I do not suppose that the highest general in our Army knows the exact amount of munitions we are going to need. The tide of the war ebbs and flows. The only way we can insure the liberties and the safety of this country is to know that we are going to have the munitions when we need them. So around some of these vast munition plants where they are turning out shells by the millions it has been necessary to provide several months in advance perhaps for a possible influx of 15,000 or 20,000 additional workers.

Suppose that a great invasion of the continent of Europe should take place and we would have several million men on the continent in a very short time. You would have a tremendous increase in the number of shells and small arms that we would have to have. If the people who are planning the production for this war did not provide in advance the necessary facilities so that they could say to the man operating that plant, "Put on an additional 10,000 men," and if he was in a position where he would have to say, "I do not have the houses, and it will take 6 months to build them," we might lose this war as a result of just that sort of thing.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I, like the previous speaker, have had several years of experience on the committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I think we have

a very unusual committee. There has been very little friction. The nature of our work is such that it deals with public buildings and public facilities in locations scattered all over the United States, so it has never been approached as a political proposition and politics has not been injected into our consideration.

At this time I wish to pay my respects to the splendid chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who naturally has to take the brunt of the work of this committee in listening to the various suggestions made by Members of Congress and listening to the Army, the Navy, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Housing Agency on the question of housing needs.

We realize that in our present emergency we must do things that probably we would not do in our ordinary activities. However, we are at war and we must provide houses for men who are engaged in war industries. We have spent now about \$1,200,000,000 on housing, and this bill calls for an authorization of \$300,000,000 more. There is no question in my mind that the Federal Housing Authority needs more money. The President in his message to Congress recommended \$400,000,000. Our committee held extensive hearings that lasted over 4 weeks and we came to the conclusion that there was needed and we voted to recommend to this House an increase of \$300,000,000. Naturally, we hope the National Housing Agency will not have to use all this money. However, that will depend entirely on the Committee on Appropriations, when the representatives of the Housing Authority go before that committee to justify their needs as they have laid out their program.

I have visited a good many areas in this country where our war activities are centered, the shipyards, our naval activities, and many other activities in San Diego, and our activities in many other areas on the Pacific coast as far north as Seattle, Wash. We are all familiar with the tremendous expansion of war industries, airplane plants, shipbuilding yards, munitions dumps, and everything else that has to do with making munitions to fight this war. Naturally, into the Pacific coast area there has been a great influx of in-migrant workers. There was not the manpower there, consequently they had to be brought into that area. We have built thousands and thousands of housing units in that area.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman refers to his trip to the Pacific coast. It was my privilege to attend the hearings of the committee, and I want to thank the gentleman and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], as well as the other members of the subcommittee, for inviting me to sit in on the hearings in San Francisco. I understand that as a result of your investigation of the Bay area you feel that there are some 6,000 of these units that should be allotted to the Bay area and 1,000, particularly, to

the Hunters Point district, which is my congressional district, the Hunters Point dry dock. I wish the gentleman would go into some detail as to the situation in the San Francisco Bay area.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. We spent quite a little time in San Francisco. The gentleman is right. We made a trip to Hunters Point, where they are building new drydock facilities for the Navy. While there is a necessity for public housing, more of the dormitory type and temporary units, I think the greatest satisfaction we got out of our trip not only in San Francisco and in Los Angeles but in almost every other community on the coast was that we found that private capital could absorb most of the needs from now on. Of course, the buildings we have already programmed are not yet completed. In almost every area where we made our investigation we found that the public and private programs kept ahead of the manpower employed in the area.

Mr. ROLPH. You found that particularly true in the San Francisco Bay area, did you not?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. That is true. While there will be needed in the future in some localities on the Pacific Coast additional temporary housing and dormitories to take care of the influx of in-migrant workers, there also has been an extensive allotment of priorities to private builders, so that they can utilize vacant lots in the communities where they already have facilities such as sewers, sidewalks, water, and electricity, which will eliminate the use of strategic material. That is the picture we found.

We visited Burbank, where there was a public housing program. We had a hearing and a meeting in the city of Burbank. They said they did not want any more public housing, but they were in position right then and there to build 2,000 private homes.

We must realize that we are not going to scrap all of these large industrial plants that we have built to make munitions of war. They are still going to be utilized. There will be a certain amount of permanency after this war is all over which will add to the value of the communities. Certainly we want to build in these communities as many private homes as we possibly can, or build them by private contract, so that we will have a permanent investment, and not only have a housing unit that pays its proportionate share of the taxes of the community but also an American who is contented and satisfied because he is living in his own home.

Mr. ROLPH. May I say that as far as the permanent homes are concerned, Hunters Point is a definite improvement and will perhaps be the largest repair station in the entire country.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. That is true, and with our two-ocean Navy there is no question but what you will need those facilities to make the necessary repairs, and so forth.

I just want to make one further observation relative to Detroit. We regret that we did not have an opportunity on our trip to stop off in Detroit,

but as I recollect, there have been about 26,800 allocations made to private builders. That does not mean that that is going to be the limit.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Is that all the private builders could absorb—that 26,000?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. No; I do not think so. In a previous visit to Detroit I think I know somewhat of the sentiment of the real estate men and the private builders.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman understands me.

What I want is for the private builders to develop this program to the fullest extent themselves, and then if it is necessary for us to supplement it, all right. I would be willing to go that far, but I do not want the Government coming in and building any more Government projects for rental developments, when we have our own private builders who are able to do that job and are only waiting for the material. We are waiting for the material to get priorities to do the work.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. In answer to the gentleman, let me say that for several months there has been a closer relationship established between the Federal Housing Authority and the private contractors of the country. They have a better understanding.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to thank the gentleman and his committee, because they were largely responsible for bringing about that condition. I know that condition has been developed now. It is a good condition, and I want to thank you and your committee for doing that splendid work, because it is in the right direction.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. With regard to private housing, it is our understanding now that if there are a thousand houses to be built in a community an agreement has been between the Housing Authority and the private builders. They are all invited in before any action is taken, and the program is laid before them; they are then given an opportunity to take a part or all of that construction. It has taken some time, as the gentleman will appreciate, to bring about that harmonious relationship between the private builders and the Federal Housing Authority.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman is aware of the fact that several thousand homes are badly needed in the San Francisco Bay area, particularly in the Hunters Point district.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman that your colleague from San Francisco [Mr. ROLPH] has just brought out that fact, and if I recollect, there have been about 7,000 or more units authorized for that area. That is, to take care of the increase in migrant workers who will be employed at Hunters Point. Some of those units are being built now. We found that they were just keeping ahead of the employment at Hunters Point when we were out there on our inspection.

I presume that the additional housing will be completed in time so that there will be places for these people to live who are going to work at Hunters Point.

I think that covers what the gentleman had in mind. We made a very comprehensive study of the situation not only at Hunters Point but in the whole San Francisco Bay area.

Mr. WELCH. I visited there within the past 30 days, and I know how badly those homes are needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to make my position clear, because it may appear as if I were opposing this legislation. I am really not opposing this bill and I am not opposing this committee. I think the committee in itself is a splendid committee and has done a fine job and has tried to clear up a bad mess in this Government housing. I am definitely and unalterably opposed to any more of these Government housing projects—Federal Housing projects for rental. The people of the city of Detroit are not renters. They are home owners. They want to own a home of their own. They want to have a garden. They want a place for their children to play. They do not want to be cooped up in any of these rental projects.

We have had more trouble, we have had no end of grief ever since we have had these Government projects put into our city. We just do not want any more of these Government rental projects. They have been the cause of a lot of our worry, grief, and turmoil. They have caused no end of misunderstandings, jealousies and hatreds.

I understand that this bill calls for mobile houses, temporary houses, which are needed, and which can be moved from place to place wherever the necessity is visible for our war effort, and that all of these temporary houses will be removed when the war is over. I am going to vote for the bill, but I do say that I hope this Congress will take a firm position in the future and allow our private building industry to build our homes for our people. In Detroit we do not need all this Government help, because our builders were doing a splendid job. Our private builders under the F. H. A. program were supplying homes, but what happened was that Government housing agencies took the priorities away from our private builders under the F. H. A. program. Those critical materials were thrown over into Federal public housing agencies. So the private builders had to stand idly by and watch the Government housing being built by Government agencies. It was not a good thing. It is not a healthy thing. I, for one, am going to oppose it and I do not care who is going to be for it in my city. I do know that 95 percent of the people of my city are opposed to it. They want home ownership. They do not want rental projects. They want F. H. A. houses built by reputable builders according to high building

standards. They want homes that meet the needs of the housewife and her family of children. Nearly every worker in the city of Detroit has \$400 or \$500 for a down payment to purchase a home under the F. H. A.

Today they are actually being denied the right to purchase a home. They are denied the right to be home owners. They must be renters. Under present regulations a builder must build houses for rent, and not for sale. This may sound silly, but it is true. If you have \$500 in your pocket and ask a builder to sell you a house he cannot do it. "I'm sorry, but they are built for rent, Government regulations," he says to the would-be purchaser.

I say that this is not a healthy condition.

Priorities on building materials should be first given to F. H. A. builders. All that they can use should be released to the private builders to continue their program under F. H. A., as originally planned. Then, if the private builders cannot fill the needs for homes for war workers, then, and only then, should national housing agencies step in. Only then should priorities be released to the national housing agencies. I charge that the national housing agencies actually and deliberately destroyed our F. H. A. building program in the city of Detroit and set us back 2 years in home construction. We did not need their meddling and interference, their heckling and grabbing off priorities on critical building materials. And to the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], I want to say that we definitely will not stand for it any longer. They have hurt us deeply and seriously and we do not want to see them around our city. And our city housing commission can get out with them. They have muddled and messed up our housing situation so badly that they have not a friend in town. I have spoken to Mr. LANHAM, the chairman, and I feel that he is in sympathy with my views. Evidently our Detroit situation is not an isolated case, and this national housing rental program under supervision of city housing commissions has fizzled out all over the country.

I repeat, we are a city of home owners, not renters. Our people want to purchase houses built under F. H. A. by private builders. Home ownership is the surest guaranty against fascism and communism and makes for loyal Americans at home.

The Clerk may read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,500,000,000."*

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds unanimously voted to report three committee amendments necessary to carry out the purposes of the committee in assuring the temporary nature

of this construction and its use, and by direction of the committee I offer those amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments be read and considered together, in view of the fact that they relate to the same purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM. At the end of the bill insert a new section:

"SEC. 4. That the said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title III the following new section:

"SEC. 313. The Administrator shall, as promptly as may be practicable and in the public interest, remove all housing under his jurisdiction which is of a temporary character, as determined by him, and constructed under the provisions of this act, Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Public Laws 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress. Such removal shall, in any event, be accomplished not later than 2 years after the President declares that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist, with the exception only of such housing as the Administrator, after consultation with local communities, finds is still needed in the interest of the orderly demobilization of the war effort: *Provided*, That all such exceptions shall be reexamined annually by the Administrator and that all such exceptions and re-examinations shall be reported to the Congress."

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM. At the end of the bill insert a new section:

"SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act, approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM. At the end of the bill insert a new section:

"SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: '*Provided further*, That the term "administrative expenses" as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities.'"

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the very able chairman of this committee before which this bill has been pending for the very efficient and competent way in which it was handled, and particularly commend and thank the committee for presenting these committee amendments.

Back in April, I introduced H. R. 2518 for the purpose of attempting to effectuate the express intention of the Congress directed to the demolition of these buildings, these temporary houses, after the emergency. The original Lanham Act contained a provision that it was the intention of Congress that defense housing be of a temporary nature and taken down after the war. I was somewhat fearful that absence of funds for their demolition might be used as an excuse for their continuance after the emergency, so introduced my bill providing that funds be set up for this purpose out of rents.

My bill, similar in provision to these amendments, was local in its scope. The committee amendment is Nation-wide in its scope. It provides the means for carrying out the expressed intention of the Congress as to demolition of temporary housing after the war. In my opinion, it is not only necessary but extremely wise.

Some of this temporary housing, as many of us know, is located in sections where it was not particularly wanted, but the communities accepted it in furtherance of the war effort. It is substandard, not in keeping with surrounding properties; and if, after the war, it is not taken down, it will become more substandard, detrimental to values of surrounding properties, and in many instances might, as was the case after the last war, become ghost cities or possibly be sold to bargain-hunting private investors and rented as substandard properties out of keeping with the surrounding homes or carried on permanently as a Government-owned housing proposition which is contrary to the intent of the Congress. We do not want to put the Government further in the permanent real-estate business. I am happy that my bill, local in its scope, has, by this amendment, been strengthened, enlarged, and made Nation-wide. Again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you on your splendid work and thank you for your cooperation.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON: On page 1, line 7, after the word "thereof", strike out "\$1,500,000,000" and insert "\$1,400,000,000."

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely changes the authorization of the appropriation from \$300,000,000 to \$200,000,000. The bill for the \$300,000,000 additional authorization was

not reported unanimously from the committee. There were some of us who did not feel that \$300,000,000 was necessary at this time, but due to the fact that there was an urgent need to get through before the recess or adjournment the bill was voted out and allowed to go to the committee of the House for further consideration.

I have pointed out some instances of waste and extravagance, and it is those instances which have caused me to offer this amendment. I am sure that the Federal Housing Administration with private funds can take care of a lot of the housing that is being programed for construction by the funds authorized in this bill. I am sure that if they will build the houses which are much needed on the west coast and in other places and cease construction of houses in areas where they are definitely not needed that \$200,000,000 will very adequately do the job. I want to recall to you again the figures I offered here earlier this afternoon: Eighteen percent of the 17,000 persons employed in the National Housing Agency are paid \$3,800 a year or more—more than 18 percent—more than \$12,000,000 a year. This to me is preposterous. The very idea that 18 percent of these people would be drawing down more money than do lieutenant colonels in the Army does not seem right to me. Then I pointed out a lot of projects in Indiana with which I am very familiar, some very near home, that were programed where there absolutely has never been need shown for them. Mr. Blandford, when he appeared before the Rules Committee in executive session, did not point out a single place where these houses were needed. In one case in Indiana they finished 288 houses in March and have rented only 242 to date. Yet they are going ahead with the construction of 2,700 more and at the same time are making plans to move those houses to some other area. They have 350 within 13 miles of my home that are definitely going to be standing there idle, with no use for them; no one will ever live in them.

No one has pointed out to me how these empty houses are going to expedite the winning of the war. Some one made the statement that the Army and the Navy had originally planned a program which would make these houses necessary. In most of the instances I have pointed out to you the Navy or Army program has not been changed one iota. In one instance it has been changed and may account for part of the vacancy that exists. I want to read a telegram from that area which came to me yesterday from a man wanting defense work because there is a serious unemployment situation at this time.

The request of the President was for housing for in-migrant war workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it becomes a question of whose judgment we should follow with reference to the amount in this bill. The message of the President, the recommendations of the War Department, the

Navy Department, the War Production Board, the various workers concerned and the representatives of private industry are for \$400,000,000. The Senate has passed a bill for \$400,000,000. The committee after very careful and deliberate consideration decided to report this bill for \$300,000,000. Consequently we have already made a reduction of \$100,000,000 in the amount that has been recommended by all of the agencies concerned with this housing.

I call your attention to the fact that this measure is simply an authorization and that in getting the appropriations to carry out these projects it is necessary for the administrative agencies to make out their case before the Committee on Appropriations. In my judgment the amount should not have been reduced to \$300,000,000 as an authorization, and I think it clear we should not adopt this amendment, especially in view of the fact that the committee has made a reduction of 25 percent in the amount suggested. This amendment to reduce by 50 percent the amount recommended by all these authorities should not prevail.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I heartily agree with what the chairman of our committee has said. I was originally for reducing it to the figure which the gentleman from Indiana has suggested. We had that vote in the committee and we were defeated. We made a compromise cut to \$300,000,000. It is the hope of every member of this committee, and I know the same is true of every Member of Congress, that this committee or the Federal Housing Authority does not have to use it, but this is an authorization and it will have to go before the Appropriations Committee and they will have to be shown how this money is going to be spent before they will grant it. They have the final say as to how much money this organization is going to get. They may not give them a nickel.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague; and may I make the statement that with reference to the Navy Department I hold here the confidential information given us place by place which shows that the Navy will require within this next fiscal year beginning tomorrow 175,000 units for the Navy alone.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this authorization is approved does the gentleman expect that any of the money will actually be available before the end of 1943?

Mr. LANHAM. It is certainly hoped so, because the time when such building as is necessary can be done most economically would be during the summer and the late fall. That is one thing that gives urgency to the consideration of this measure at this time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we will probably have to wait now for a conference report from the Senate on the deficiency bill, which is the bill in which the Kerr amendment was adopted.

The Senate has been offered two compromises on that amendment, one providing that these three men, Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett, men whom we eliminated from the appropriation would continue on their jobs until October 1, at which time the President could submit their names to the Senate and the Senate could vote either to confirm or reject them. The second compromise provided that they could stay on until November 15.

The Senate has rejected both of these proposals, which is all right with me. I am glad it did. I do not think that the House would have been willing to accept those compromises and if the Senate now accepts either one of the compromises it is taking a very arbitrary position and one which they cannot maintain. The Senate has said that the House should not interfere with the executive department of the Government and if they accept one of these compromises they are taking the position that while we should not interfere they are willing to vote to confirm these men. It comes with poor grace from the Senate to say to us that we should not interfere with the executive department when they recently passed a bill providing that the Senate must confirm every employee of the Government who draws a salary of \$4,500 or more.

If the conference report comes back with a compromise of that sort, so far as I am concerned we shall reject it. The report of the Kerr committee has been printed for every individual to study, so there is no reason for their position, and I intend to ask for a roll call vote on it. I hope that the House will accept no compromise and that we will vote to maintain the position that we have taken up until this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

CONDEMNNS WALLACE-JONES SQUABBLE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this is no time for New Deal headlines to give public airing to their dirty linen, or to engage in free-for-all brawls charging each other with pre-war mistakes and failure to meet their official responsibilities in the conduct of the war. The attack unleashed by Vice President WALLACE against Commerce Secretary Jones remind us too much of what has taken place in certain countries of the Old World when officials began fighting each other. At this time, when millions of American men are giving their all to free the world from Axis domination, and the American people are making tremendous sacrifices for victory it seems to me that New Deal officials should assume leadership for national unity instead of trying to discredit each other. The many shameful inner New

Deal fights of the past 2 years give aid and comfort to our enemies, and are terrific admissions that New Deal policies have been failures.

There will be ample time for investigations when we have won the war. Personally, after unconditional surrender by our enemies, I will insist on thorough congressional investigation on such vital matters as:

First. Why did Vice President WALLACE, when serving as Secretary of Agriculture, discourage American experiments in the production of plants, shrubs, and trees, which produce quinine, castor, and other seeds for essential oils, flax fiber, hemp, jute, sisal, rubber, and hundreds of other products, which we were forced to import from the now conquered areas of the Far East? Was it because he wanted to support foreign-owned cartels dealing in the exclusive production and sale of these vital products?

Second. Why did Secretary Hull, as spokesman for the administration on foreign policy, when he was in possession of facts which plainly indicated that Germany, Japan, and Italy were arming for another world conquest, permit the sale of billions of dollars worth of war materials, like scrap iron, steel, aviation gasoline, airplanes, war machines, and machine tools, copper, and other critical metals to these countries from the resources of the United States?

Third. Why was Japan and Italy included as most-favored nations by the administration, thereby securing for them the benefit of the low tariff duties provided by the reciprocal trade law for their cheaply produced imports into the United States, which gave those countries an abundance of dollar credit with which to purchase war materials in this country?

Fourth. Why did Treasury Secretary Morgenthau purchase \$700,000,000 worth of Japanese gold at the inflated price of \$35 per ounce to be used by Japan for the purchase of war materials in the United States?

Fifth. What are the reasons for the failure of Admiral Kimmel and General Short to be on the alert the 10 days preceding the disaster at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941?

Sixth. Who are the planners for a new order for the people of the United States?

These and many other investigations of New Deal policies should take place after the war is won, and full responsibility placed where it belongs, but this is no time to stir in the mess and create disunity. The American people like a good political fight, but right now they are only interested in one fight, and that is the battle to defeat our foreign enemies and get the war over. The people will take care of those who seek to destroy our American form of government and system of free enterprise. Squabbling in Washington between New Deal chieftains should stop.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the subject matter that is before the House right now, namely, the authori-

zation of an additional \$300,000,000 for the war housing program. For the past several years the House has had before it bills relating to housing. Of course, when we first took up the matter of housing several years ago the programs were for slum-clearance low-cost housing projects. This House approved those projects for 3 or 4 years in succession; however, it was not long before the House decided that the administration and some of the principles in this low-cost slum-clearance program were not in conformity with American principles of democracy, so we refused to approve further slum-clearance low-cost housing projects.

One of the main reasons for the refusal of the Congress to approve further slum-clearance projects was that the local administration of the Housing Authority had various systems of charging rentals. When the Congress decided to approve war housing it specifically did so with the intent in mind that a system of rents be charged which would be known as economical rents insofar as possible. Everybody will admit, I believe, that war housing is absolutely necessary at the present time, and I would be the last one on the floor of this House to disapprove any program calling for war housing if absolutely necessary.

I find, however, that in many of the war housing projects the local housing administration is setting up a schedule of rents which is known as the graded rent schedule. This graded rent schedule calls for the payment of rent not based on the amount of space which the tenant occupies but based almost solely upon the amount of income which the tenant receives. For certain specified units containing exactly the same type of equipment and the same amount of space nine different amounts of rent can be charged under that schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that that is certainly not the intent of this Congress and it is certainly not the intent of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. If we are going to charge rental for these units according to the income of the tenants, then I say we are deviating from the principles of economy and the American principles upon which this Government was founded.

In the first place, if you charge rents to these various tenants according to the amount of income they receive weekly, you are putting a premium on laziness, incompetence, and absenteeism, and you are at the same time putting a penalty on energy, competence, and thrift. Therefore, in spite of the many words of praise that have been given to the administration of the National Housing Agency, in my opinion this is a matter that must be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a time of prosperity such as this is no time to foist upon the American people what I call a socialistic system of charging rent. If we are going to charge rent according to the income of an individual, why should we not carry the matter further? Why should we not charge for every commodity according to the income of the individual? We could charge for clothing according to the income of the individual, we could charge for food according to the income of the individual, and so on ad infinitum.

This is done because the Congress of the United States does not know it and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds does not know it.

I have had it said to me by officials of the Housing Agency that in a great majority of the projects under the war housing program in this country they are charging under a schedule of graded rents. In other words, if a tenant makes \$600 a year, for a certain unit he is charged \$13 a month, but if he makes \$2,000 a year he is charged \$40 for exactly the same unit, for exactly the same purpose, and although he has the same number of children.

If this Congress wants to go on record as approving such a system it certainly will have objection from me, and I think it will have objection from the people of the United States. It is a matter that in my opinion can be corrected, because under the act as originally passed and as intended by the Congress an economic rent should be charged. To foist upon the people of America a socialistic system of this kind and to fool this Congress is reprehensible to the highest degree.

The chairman of the committee told me that he was not aware that such a system was being put into effect, and I have his assurance that he will endeavor to see that the wishes of the Congress are carried out in all respects.

This matter was called to the attention of the Administrator early in February by me. If I had more time I could prove to you that this system is in effect, by showing you a circular explaining this proposition put out by certain of the local housing authorities. It reads:

For this reason, the graded-rent system provides that rents shall be fixed by the family income within certain general brackets of income called rent grades, according to the size of the family.

The writer of this circular goes on and proves it because in his explanation he says it was based on the same principle as a slum-clearance program, which this Congress has turned down.

I hope the chairman of the committee will be able to give this Congress some assurance that this socialistic program will not continue insofar as this war housing program, at least, is concerned, during this period of prosperity.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman has said. He and I have discussed this matter. The committee will be glad to give it consideration.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has just said that he would be glad to give it consideration. Is not the gentleman willing to say to the House that it certainly was not the intention of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to permit a graded rent schedule to be put in force in these war housing projects?

Mr. LANHAM. As I said to the gentleman, I do not want to assume to speak for the entire committee. We are going to have a meeting next Tuesday with the administrative authorities. Personally, I have never seen any justification for charging a different rental for property of the same kind and value. I do not know what all the circumstances may be. I was ill, as the gentleman recalls, when the matter was discussed with the committee before. At the committee hearing we shall have with the authorities on Tuesday I shall be glad to take that matter up with the gentlemen and see if we cannot get that situation worked out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman and to the Committee that I had an amendment prepared which I intended to present this afternoon. In that amendment I think were words which would have cured what I think is a reprehensible practice on the part of those in charge of these war housing projects. However, I felt in view of my conversation with the chairman that that situation would be corrected. I believe that if I had had an opportunity to present my amendment it would have been adopted by this House. I hope the committee will see that corrections are made.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that there are one or two matters to which the committee wishes to give attention, and we intend to do that when we have this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON) there were—ayes 96, noes 97.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILSON and Mr. LANHAM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 97 and noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2975, pursuant to House Resolution 271, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were ayes 135 and noes 52.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1109) to increase by \$400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill, H. R. 2975, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

SECTION 1. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,600,000,000."

Sec. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: "Provided further, That the term 'administrative expenses' as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities."

Sec. 3. That section 303 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Numbered 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in an appropriation account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for nec-

essary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 2975, as amended, as follows:

"That section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes', approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out '\$1,200,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$1,600,000,000.'"

"Sec. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: 'Provided further, That the term "administrative expenses" as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities.'

"Sec. 3. That section 303 of said act, approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in a common-fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

"Sec. 4. That the said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title III the following new section:

"Sec. 313. The Administrator shall, as promptly as may be practicable and in the public interest, remove all housing under his jurisdiction which is of a temporary character, as determined by him, and constructed under the provisions of this act, Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Public Laws 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress. Such removal shall, in any event, be accomplished not later than 2 years after the President declares that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist, with the exception of such housing as the Administrator, after consultation with local communities, finds is still needed in the interest of the orderly

demobilization of the war effort: *Provided*, That all such exceptions shall be reexamined annually by the Administrator and that all such exceptions and reexaminations shall be reported to the Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to vacate the proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 2975, was passed and lay the House bill on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The title was amended.

#### RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this week it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three particulars: First, at the conclusion of the remarks I made in the House on yesterday that I may attach a letter from the Department of Agriculture and certain tables; second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therewith a letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service, and from the Comptroller General of the United States; and, third, to include a daily prayer for victory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the request is granted.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CURLEY was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short radio communication.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech that I made as well as a speech made by Mayor LaGuardia at the Consumers' Conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a very fine tribute to the memory of Mrs. Meloney by Mrs. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] be permitted to include excerpts in the extension of his remarks made this afternoon in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Tacoma Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two or three short letters on the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include several short telegrams concerning the Motion Picture Branch of the Office of War Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today and I ask unanimous consent in lieu thereof that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program and following other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### RED ART PROPAGANDA

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I propose from time to time to bring to the attention of the Membership of this House the methods used by the Communists of the United States in making their ideology an influence if not control of various organizations.

Now that J. Stalin, dictator of Soviet Russia, has brought about the dissolution of the Comintern of the Third Internationale, everyone should be free to speak about communism in the United States without someone yelling saboteur, Nazi collaborator, or accused of undermining the war effort of the so-called

United Nations. I merely bring this point out now, not that it affects me the least bit, because I have openly opposed the ideology of communism every day for the past 22 years, and propose to do so just as long as God permits me to live; but I mention it now because many people who are unutterably opposed to communism have been afraid to say anything, due to the "gestapo" and dictatorship tactics that certain elements in our country have used to smear people who believe in the principles of our republican form of Government.

Communists have successfully invaded from time to time the field of art. At the present time Artists for Victory, Inc., in cooperation with American Artists Group, Inc., are sponsoring a national competition in art on the subject, "Interpreting the Christmas Message for Our Own Times." Everyone who knows the first lesson in communism appreciates the fact that communism is atheism. Nevertheless do not be surprised to find Communists interested in a Christmas message, especially when it promotes any of the theories of the New Deal.

As Roger Baldwin, president of the American Civil Liberties Union, said many years ago, "We must get a lot of American flags and make the people believe we are the patriotic Americans," and likewise with Earl Browder's little leaflet, entitled "Who Are the Real Americans?"

The Communists have long realized and have repeatedly stressed the importance of art as a means of propaganda, and they are brazenly making use of it in this country. They are not operating on their own as Communists, but follow their usual procedure by boring from within worthy patriotic and legitimate art societies and organizations. Having all but dominated the art projects of the W. P. A., the Communists can be depended on to make every effort to usurp all the patriotic art endeavors of the various American art groups.

Artists for Victory was conceived and was in the process of organization by the Fine Arts Federation of New York City—before Pearl Harbor—as a patriotic aid to our national defense. At that time, it will be remembered, the Communists were using every effort, including art, in their party publications, to sabotage our national defense. With our entry into the war, Artists for Victory was given impetus under the sponsorship of its originator, the Fine Arts Federation of New York City. And since then the Communists by all the subtle subversive subterfuge at their command, have made efforts to steal "Artists for Victory" as their own.

Officers of the Fine Arts Federation of New York City charge that Henry Billings, representing himself as coming from Archibald MacLeish's office—then the O. F. F.—informed them that all artist societies and organizations (including the Communists) must share in the Artists for Victory movement before it would receive governmental blessing or financial support. That Henry Billings, of Archibald MacLeish's office, was particularly intent upon having the Com-

munists bore from within Artists for Victory, is evidenced by his past record for Communist leanings. Billings was on the organizing committee of the John Reed Club School as far back as 1930. He also belonged to the American Artists Group, Inc., according to the *Daily Worker* of September 9, 1940. The pro-Communist American Artists Group, Inc., with that high-sounding patriotic designation, is now using Artists for Victory, Inc., for setting up sectional and then national art competitions with awards of from \$50 to \$300. Artists for Victory, Inc., was set up on April 8, 1942, and sponsored by the United American Artists and the American Artists' Congress, according to the *Daily Worker*, official Communist organ, of April 10, 1942, page 7. It was addressed by Lynd Ward, president of the American Artists' Congress, which has been denounced as a Communist-controlled front organization by a number of liberal artists who were formerly members, among them being George Biddle, Dr. Meyer Shapiro, Ralph M. Pearson, Lewis Mumford, and William Zorach—*Art Digest*, May 1, 1940, page 3. The active leaders of the discredited American Artists' Congress are the spearhead of Artists for Victory, Inc.

Hobart Nichols, president of the National Academy of Design, is also on the jury, the pro-Communist group having succeeded in having this outstanding artist serve as the president of Artists for Victory, Inc. But as vice president, the wily Communists selected one of their kind in Hugo Gellert, an artist on the staff of the *Daily Worker* and other Communist publications. Gellert is one of the reddest of the Reds, and has long been a notorious participant in Communist activities. Gellert as vice president of the phony Artists for Victory, Inc., will encourage his communistic type of art. An example of Gellert's artful Communist art may be found in a booklet issued by the International Workers Order, printed in 16 languages and in full color. Gellert, who illustrated the booklet, goes the Communist limit in a graphic effort to stir up race hatred, but how this effort may be made to conform with any patriotic efforts of American Artists Group, Inc. of which he is vice president, is not made known by Communist Hugo Gellert. He has always been a prime mover on the Communist art front. He was active in forming the Artists Union, a Red group in the Communist front, which was so patently communistic, that Gellert and others dissolved it to form the United American Artists, affiliated with the C. I. O., which at the time seemed to have domination over the art commissions under W. P. A. The United American Artists flourished for a time, securing most of the art commissions dispensed by W. P. A. But with W. P. A. on its way out, the C. I. O. fired most of the membership of United American Artists for failure to pay dues. This twice-defunct group of Communists found some fellow travelers of the same tinge in the American Artists' Congress, which in turn was quietly disbanded

when it was unmasked as a Communist front. And so from one organization to its successor, all bearing patriotic titles to disguise their real intentions, the heterogeneous Red groups have banded together under the American Artists Group, Inc., which now pretends to patriotic effort in furthering Communist propaganda, commercialism and politics through fostering Artists for Victory, Inc. This organization by infiltration and dubious methods is now frustrating the real American patriotic efforts of the Fine Arts Federation of New York City, the originators of Artists for Victory. While the Communists in this country may in good faith accede to the dissolution of the Comintern, and profess no more interest in the "world revolution," they are carrying on their subversive activities in our cultural, economic, and political institutions for the advancement of the cause of the Communist Party of America, and its complete domination of the United States.

On the jury of the national competition sponsored by the Artists for Victory, Inc., in cooperation with the American Artists Group, Inc., there are men like Hobart Nichols and Harry Wickey, eminent artists, whose integrity and patriotism are not subject to challenge. Nor can there be any question about the need of suitable propaganda in the field of art in support of the war. The jury includes also Rockwell Kent, whose past activities and opinions have been such as to make him unsuitable for this post.

Mr. Kent is listed as the president of the Artists League of America, which was formed out of the United American Artists and the American Artists' Congress, hereinbefore described, at a national conference held June 14, 1924, and described enthusiastically in the *Daily Worker* of June 15 and 17, 1942. The meeting was held at the Fraternal Clubhouse in New York City, headquarters of the International Workers Order, a Communist-controlled fraternal organization. Participating in the sessions were Samuel Sillen, writer for the *New Masses*; Paul Strand, of the League of American Writers; Art Young and William Gropper, both cartoonists for the *Daily Worker*, and Samuel Putnam, a Communist writer for the *Daily Worker*. Art Young was elected honorary president.

Rockwell Kent has clearly expressed his sympathy and support of the Communist Party and the movement for which it stands. His name appears as a member of a committee of professional groups for Browder and Ford, the Communist candidates for President and Vice President in 1936. In 1938, he supported the candidacy of Israel Amter, Communist candidate for Congressman at Large in New York. He was a member of the United May Day Provisional Committee organized by the Communist Party in New York City in 1939. In the *New Masses* of February 18, 1936, page 21, he openly declares that he regards as the only worth-while political cause of today—communism,

Kent, who was the keynote speaker of the artists' win the war conference of June 14, 1942, gives ample evidence in his book, *This Is My Own*, of his opposition to the war and to our Government during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact. His attitude toward the war has changed since June 22, 1941, when Russia was invaded by Hitler. Permit me to cite some of the choicest passages from Mr. Kent's book:

Meanwhile they scream for war. Legislators complaisant to the 10-year status quo of unemployment, active in opposition to the rights and aspirations of labor, zealous in their advocacy of the curtailment of civil liberties, traitorous and subversive to the principles of democracy in America, now call upon us in the holy name of democracy to fight for it abroad. On the foundation of Nation-wide unemployment, underprivilege, and discontent our Congress and administration pile a final, crushing weight of armament—to save democracy! To save? To bury it. Deeply and from my heart, in utter reverence I pray; God damn them all.

In the fall of 1939 we warned ourselves, each other \* \* \* we swore to God, each other, and ourselves to keep at peace. I'll keep my oath. Let others just keep theirs (pp. 392, 393).

While Kent was most outspoken in his condemnation of the United States and what it stands for, he was equally frank in his admiration for the Soviet Union and its policies, as indicated by the following excerpts from *This Is My Own*:

And Russia and the non-aggression pact? "Good," I exclaimed. "They've served that perjured double-crossing Allied outfit right. \* \* \* And when the Soviet armies grabbed off half of Poland, I, we, and everybody with a grain of common sense and human decency was glad. \* \* \* And Finland? And Sweden? They're all right. Stalin, it seems, didn't want them. \* \* \* I'm grasping for the truth in all experience—in Communists. They've been so often right (pp. 384, 385).

On page 291 of his book, Rockwell Kent speaks in highest praise of the following organizations cited as subversive by the Attorney General: League for Peace and Democracy, National Committee for People's Rights, International Labor Defense, the American Youth Congress, the National Negro Congress, the League of American Writers. He admits his own membership in the following Communist-controlled organizations:

American Artists' Congress, vice chairman.

United Office and Professional Workers of America.

American Youth Congress.

Descendants of the American Revolution.

Committee for Fair Play to Puerto Rico.

International Labor Defense.

National Committee for People's Rights, chairman.

League of American Writers.

International Workers Order, vice president.

American League for Peace and Democracy, member national committee.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign.

In addition his record shows his association and support of the following communistic organizations:

National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights; signer of open letter against the Dies committee, *Daily Worker*, May 13, 1940, pages 1 and 5.

Frontier Films; member, advisory board; letterhead.

Letter to the President defending the Communist Party and the New Masses; signer, member of initiating committee; *New Masses*, April 2, 1940, page 21.

Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy supported by the Communist Party; sponsor; *New Masses*, March 16, 1937, page 26.

Progressive Committee to Rebuild the American Labor Party—Communist-supported wing; member, executive committee, leaflet.

*New Masses*, Communist weekly; contributor, August 23, 1938, page 9; October 18, 1938, page 21; April 26, 1938, page 21; February 22, 1938, page 22.

Letter urging closer cooperation with the Soviet Union; signer; *Soviet Russia Today*, September 1939, page 25.

Open letter to American liberals defending the Moscow trials; signer; *Soviet Russia Today*, March 1937, pages 14, 15.

Conference on Pan-American Democracy; sponsor; letterhead, November 16, 1938.

*Soviet Russia Today*; artist; November 1937, page 70.

In the light of the foregoing facts, disclosing a loyalty to communism and the Soviet Union paramount to his loyalty to the United States, Rockwell Kent has demonstrated his total unfitness to act as juror in any competition devoted to patriotic purposes.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, until further notice, on account of illness in family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. ELMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of Senate of the following titles:

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or

civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1648. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 1, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1869. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Cross to George F. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3072. A bill to amend section 3540 of the Revenue Act of 1941, entitled "Use of Motor Vehicle Tax"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3073. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of

voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3083. A bill to repeal the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act relating to the giving of notice of threatened interruptions in war production, etc., and to political contributions by labor organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3084. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938, so as to grant for an indefinite period the right to locate and patent mining claims within certain areas of the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Missouri:

H. R. 3085. A bill adjusting the compensation of civilian employees in the laundries of the Army Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3086. A bill to provide identification buttons for persons discharged from military or naval service on account of physical defects not due to personal misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3088. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3089. A bill to exempt from income tax certain individuals with gross incomes of \$1,800 or less whose gross income has not increased by more than 20 percent over that for 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3090. A bill to provide for compulsory savings during present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 until January 1, 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. Res. 277. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the operations and expenditures of the Board of Economic Warfare, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and any other affiliated or subsidiary corporations in the acquisition of critical materials; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 279. Resolution authorizing appointment of a special committee to study prices, wages, and rents in order to curb inflation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. Res. 280. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the procurement of strategic and critical materials through the agencies of the Board of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 281. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems, and the use of public lands in rehabilitation of veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 282. Resolution authorizing investigation by the Committee on the Public

Lands of naval petroleum reserve No. 1 and adjacent public lands; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Dr. W. R. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother of Arthur J. Martin, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCKENZIE:

H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita Tabor Hammack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGEEHEE:

H. R. 3078. A bill for the relief of Pauline B. Werner, Loretta M. Coats, and Charles H. Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3079. A bill granting a pension to Jessie Meryhew Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 3080. A bill for the relief of Howard Rasmussen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Robert Branch; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 3082. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1782. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Lulu Bon Rice, of Ann Arbor, Mich., and signed by some 49 other residents of that community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1783. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 60 members of the parent-teacher organization of Tioga County, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1784. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry S. Mable and 109 citizens of Bay Village, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1785. Also, petition of Mrs. John Martimer and 100 citizens of La Valle, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1786. Also, petition of Magdalene C. Eller and 72 citizens of Haxtun, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1787. Also, petition of Mrs. H. P. Ramsey and 40 citizens of Littleton, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1788. Also, petition of Mrs. Albert Stabler and seven citizens of Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1789. Also, petition of Hazel D. Belstel and 92 citizens of Ruffs Dale, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1790. Also, petition of Mrs. C. F. Truax and 71 citizens of Minot, N. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1791. Also, petition of 129 members of the New Mexico Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Sandoval, N. Mex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1792. Also, petition of Phillip Swing and 39 citizens of Evansville, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1793. Also, petition of Frances Reed Rowe and 42 citizens of Genesee, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1794. Also, petition of Martha E. Mark and 20 citizens of Millersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1795. Also, petition of Mrs. A. G. Baram and 143 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve man-

power, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1796. Also, petition of Rev. E. Stanley Watkins and 19 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1797. Also, petition of Annie E. Leslie and 44 citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1798. Also, petition of Mable Saunders and 113 citizens of Blue Earth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1799. Also, petition of Flora B. Kaigh and 20 citizens of David City, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1800. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Kilgore and 19 citizens of Woodruff, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1801. Also, petition of Lillie Manney and 27 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1802. Also, petition of Grace Anderson and 20 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1803. Also, petition of Mrs. G. H. Wilkin and 28 citizens of Berkeley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1804. Also, petition of Pauline Parker and 40 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1805. Also, petition of Mrs. Robert T. Tumbleston and 1,347 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1806. Also, petition of Anna McHatton and 20 citizens of Akron, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1807. Also, petition of Mrs. W. L. Jenkins and 26 citizens of Fayetteville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1808. Also, petition of S. M. Dunnam, Jr., and 45 citizens of Lynn Haven, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1809. Also, petition of H. W. Berneking and 41 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1810. Also, petition of Mrs. E. R. Small and 32 citizens of Princeton, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1811. Also, petition of Robert H. Ayers and 63 citizens of Andrews, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1812. Also, petition of Frances A. DeGraff and 230 citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1813. Also, petition of Alice G. Moncre and 20 citizens of Richmond, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to re-

duce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1814. Also, petition of Mrs. Lionel Bertrand and 167 citizens of Welsh, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1815. Also, petition of Alice Porter and 58 citizens of Allegan, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1816. Also, petition of Ethel I. Swisher and Mary Savage and 75 citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1817. Also, petition of Joey Denton and 20 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1818. Also, petition of Mrs. A. G. Nelman and 58 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1819. Also, petition of V. E. Jennings and 20 citizens of Buckhannon, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1820. By Mr. CARTER: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the State of California, urging the creation of a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army and endorsing House bill 997 and urging its enactment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1821. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the State of California, memorializing the Congress to pass the Lea-Weich bill suspending the exemption from tolls in favor of the United States Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge during the war period; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1822. Also, petition protesting against the release of Japanese from the relocation centers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. Also, petition of Jennie Price, of Berkeley, Calif., and 40 citizens of Alameda County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1824. Also, petition of Olive B. Jones and 40 other residents of Richmond, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the

Bryson bill, prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1825. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mrs. George G. Foster, of Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 1192; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1826. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Yakima, Dayton, Garfield, Palouse, Selah, Cowiche, Moxee, and Walla Walla to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1827. By the SPEAKER: petition of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission, Department of Commerce, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning consideration of House bill 1012; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in times of stillness, as we pause in the midst of rushing cares, we hear like a distant song the call of the better angels of our nature. Forbid that the toil of life or the dust of common days should rob us of life's meaning, its dignity, and its beauty. Save us from the supreme folly of missing Thy glory by turning to grasp for the baubles of vanity with our foolish freedom, our fleeting pleasures, and our fatal self-indulgence.

We hear the low, sad music of humanity as in disrupted and invaded lands men mingle tears with hopeless tasks and days and nights are filled with terror and horror. Even as we brood on the pain and anguish of the world, by faith may we discern a rainbow of hope through the tears of the exploited and the disinherited. May there be redemption in the cross to which by selfish power humanity is nailed. Seeing we spend our days as a tale that is told, let us haste to speak the best that is within us, lest ere ever the day has worn to noon we hear the one clear call before our word is said and our deed is done. May we not neglect or defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1109) to increase by \$400,000,000 the amount authorized to